

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY • Social Security Administration • Washington, D. C.

Social Security Bulletin



July 1951

Volume 14

Number 7

Policies for the Use of Federal Child Welfare Funds

Income of Aged Persons, 1948

THE SOCIAL SECURITY BULLETIN is published monthly under authority of Public Resolution No. 57, approved May 11, 1922 (42 Stat. 541), as amended by section 307, Public Act 212, Seventy-second Congress, approved June 30, 1932. The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (Sept. 11, 1950).

☆☆☆

The BULLETIN is prepared in the Division of Research and Statistics, Office of the Commissioner, Social Security Administration. It reports current data on operations of the Social Security Administration and the results of research and analysis pertinent to the social security program, and is issued primarily for distribution to agencies directly concerned with the administration of the Social Security Act. Statements in articles do not necessarily reflect final conclusions or official policies of the Social Security Administration. Any part of this publication may be reproduced with appropriate credit to the BULLETIN.

☆☆☆

The BULLETIN is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom all purchase orders, with accompanying remittance, should be sent. The annual subscription is \$2.00 in the United States, Canada, and Mexico and \$2.75 in all other countries; price of single copy, 20 cents.

☆☆☆

THE SOCIAL SECURITY YEARBOOK, an annual calendar-year supplement to the BULLETIN, was issued as a separate publication for the years 1939-48. Calendar-year data for later years will be published as an annual statistical supplement in each September issue of the BULLETIN. Most of the early issues of the YEARBOOK are available from the Superintendent of Documents as follows: 1939, 50 cents; 1940 and 1941, 70 cents each; 1942 and 1944, 50 cents each; other issues are out of print.

Social Security Bulletin



July 1951
Volume 14
Number 7

In this issue:

Social Security in Review:

Program operations.....	1
Selected current statistics (table).....	2

Policies for the Use of Federal Child Welfare Funds, by Mildred Arnold.....	3
---	---

Income of Aged Persons, 1948, by Jacob Fisher.....	10
--	----

Notes and Brief Reports:

Old-age benefit awards, 1950.....	14
Benefits in current-payment status, State distribution...	15

Recent Publications.....	17
--------------------------	----

Current Operating Statistics (tables).....	19
--	----

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OSCAR R. EWING, *Administrator*

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

ARTHUR J. ALTMAYER, *Commissioner*

WILLIAM L. MITCHELL, *Deputy Commissioner*

Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance OSCAR C. POGGE, <i>Director</i>	Bureau of Federal Credit Unions CLAUDE R. ORCHARD, <i>Director</i>
Bureau of Public Assistance JANE M. HOEY, <i>Director</i>	Division of Research and Statistics I. S. FALK, <i>Director</i>
Children's Bureau KATHARINE F. LENROOT, <i>Chief</i>	Division of the Actuary ROBERT J. MYERS, <i>Chief Actuary</i>
Appeals Council JOSEPH E. McELVAIN, <i>Chairman</i>	

Social Security in Review

DECLINING caseloads and reduced expenditures marked the public assistance programs in April. The net decrease in the rolls was somewhat larger than in any month since last October, when the programs first reflected the impact of the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act.

The reductions from the March totals were widespread. Declines in the old-age assistance caseloads in all but nine States resulted in an 0.4-percent reduction in the national total. General assistance cases were fewer in 43 States, and the result was a 7.2-percent decline in the national rolls. A drop of 0.9 percent in the programs for aid to dependent children, reflecting decreases in 31 States, brought the number of families receiving aid below the total for April 1950; this is the first month since July 1945 that the caseload has dropped below the total for the same month of the preceding year. Nationally, aid to the blind caseloads would have declined slightly as 29 States reported fewer recipients. These drops were more than offset, however, by a 24-percent increase in Texas, where blind persons receiving old-age assistance were transferred back to the aid to the blind program. With the approval of Pennsylvania's plan for aid to the blind by the Social Security Administration, there are now 48 States operating programs for the blind under approved plans.

Unlike the older assistance programs, aid to the permanently and totally disabled has continued to grow. The number of recipients in the 29 States reporting programs in operation in April increased about 10 percent to a total of almost 88,000 recipi-

ents. Six States accounted for about two-thirds of the additional cases. Most of the recipients added to the rolls of the new programs continued to come from the other assistance programs—largely, as in the past, from general assistance.

Expenditures for public assistance in April totaled less than \$191.6 million, the lowest figure in 18 months. The April decline of \$2.7 million resulted from reductions in old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and particularly general assistance. These reductions more than offset the increases in aid to the permanently and totally disabled and aid to the blind. Average payments went down somewhat for each of the five assistance programs, although only general assistance showed lower payments in more than half the States. The averages paid under old-age assistance, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to the blind were reduced only a few cents; under aid to dependent children, 29 cents per family; and under general assistance, more than \$1.

Arizona and Arkansas made substantial cuts in payments in three programs. In Arizona the legislature lowered the maximums, and the average payment was reduced \$14 for aid to dependent children and between \$1.00 and \$1.60 for old-age assistance and aid to the blind. Decreased revenues necessitated drastic cuts in the same three programs in Arkansas. The proportion of need met was reduced enough to lower the average payment almost \$7 in aid to dependent children and \$4-5 in old-age assistance and aid to the blind.

Two States made relatively large

upward adjustments in payments in April. The District of Columbia increased the proportion of need met and thus raised its averages in all five programs. For aid to dependent children, the average went up about \$6 and for the other programs, about \$3. Liberalized budgeting procedures and an increase in the legal maximums increased payments in Utah, and averages were raised about \$2 for old-age assistance and aid to the blind recipients, more than \$4 for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and almost \$10 for families receiving aid to dependent children.

UNDER THE OLD-AGE and survivors insurance program, almost 3.9 million persons were receiving monthly benefits at the end of April—about 81,000 more than at the end of March. April was the first month since August 1950 in which the net increase in the number of beneficiaries was less than 100,000.

The number of retired workers receiving old-age benefits exceeded 2 million for the first time in April. The million mark had been reached in September 1948. Thus, while almost 9 years elapsed before 1 million old-age beneficiaries were receiving monthly benefits, the 2-million mark was reached in approximately 2½ years. The liberalized insured-status requirements under the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act were chiefly responsible for this rapid growth; in the 8 months following enactment of the amendments the number of old-age beneficiaries increased by 600,000.

Monthly benefits being paid at the end of April totaled \$139.6 million,

\$2.4 million more than at the end of March. The 2 million old-age beneficiaries received \$86.5 million, about 62 percent of the total.

In the first four months of 1951, new employee account numbers under old-age and survivors insurance were issued to about 1,817,000 persons. Thus, chiefly because of the new coverage under the 1950 amendments, slightly more than 3 times as many new account numbers were issued as in the corresponding period of 1950. The total of new employee accounts issued in 1951 includes those of approximately 235,000 persons in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, where the registrations under the new coverage continue to be active.

By May 18, 1951, approximately 675,000 employers (including those in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) had registered as having workers in the newly covered groups. Of these about 75 percent had household employees.

Seven States (Arkansas, California, Idaho, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Utah, and West Virginia) had signed coverage agreements by the middle of May. Such agreements had also been signed by two interstate instrumentalities (the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission). The agreement of one additional State (Wisconsin) was awaiting the approval of the Commissioner for Social Security, and seven States (Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wyoming) were actively negotiating agreements.

TOTAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, according to the Bureau of the Census, showed little change between March and April, and unemployment dropped by 400,000 to 1.7 million—the lowest postwar level for April. There was, nevertheless, a sharp rise in initial claims filed for benefits under the State unemployment insurance programs. Many of these claimants were not, however, newly unemployed workers.

The beginning of a new uniform benefit year in some States and the start of a new calendar quarter in

(Continued on page 22)

Selected current statistics

[Corrected to June 8, 1951]

Item	April 1951	March 1951	April 1950	Calendar year	
				1950	1949
<i>Labor Force</i> ¹ (in thousands)					
Total civilian.....	61,789	62,325	62,183	63,099	62,105
Employed.....	60,044	60,179	58,668	59,957	58,710
Covered by old-age and survivors insurance ²			33,988	35,165	34,314
Covered by State unemployment insurance ³	34,300	34,400	31,615	32,809	31,581
Unemployed.....	1,744	2,147	3,515	3,142	3,395
<i>Personal Income</i> ⁴ (in billions; seasonally adjusted at annual rates)					
Total.....	\$244.3	\$242.8	\$213.8	\$223.2	\$206.1
Employees' income ⁵	164.6	163.5	138.2	144.9	134.5
Proprietors' and rental income.....	47.5	47.2	39.8	43.6	41.7
Personal interest income and dividends.....	19.7	19.5	18.2	19.2	17.2
Public aid ⁶	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.2
Social insurance and related payments ⁷	6.8	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.8
Veterans' subsistence allowances ⁸ and bonuses.....	1.4	1.5	2.8	2.3	2.0
Miscellaneous income payments ⁹	2.0	1.9	5.8	4.4	1.7
<i>Old-Age and Survivors Insurance</i>					
Monthly benefits:					
Current-payment status: ¹⁰					
Number (in thousands).....	3,890	3,809	2,880		
Amount (in thousands).....	\$139,637	\$137,259	\$59,638	\$1,018,149	\$655,832
Average primary benefit.....	\$43.90	\$43.10	\$20.22		
Awards (in thousands):					
Number.....	126	148	55	963	682
Amount.....	\$3,903	\$4,734	\$1,265	\$36,234	\$15,343
<i>Unemployment Insurance</i> ¹¹					
Initial claims (in thousands).....	919	693	1,178	12,251	17,660
Weeks of unemployment claimed (in thousands).....	3,913	3,996	7,871	78,654	102,612
Weeks compensated (in thousands).....	3,109	3,552	6,758	67,860	86,638
Weekly average beneficiaries (in thousands).....	740	807	1,550	1,304	1,696
Benefits paid (in millions) ¹²	\$62	\$72	\$139	\$1,373	\$1,737
Average weekly payment for total unemployment.....	\$80.68	\$80.67	\$80.88	\$80.76	\$80.47
<i>Public Assistance</i>					
Recipients (in thousands):					
Old-age assistance.....	2,743	2,754	2,768		
Aid to dependent children:					
Families.....	634	640	642		
Children.....	1,625	1,636	1,629		
Aid to the blind.....	96	95	94		
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled ¹³	88	80			
General assistance.....	377	406	605		
Average payments:					
Old-age assistance.....	\$43.07	\$43.14	\$43.69		
Aid to dependent children (per family).....	74.78	75.01	72.83		
Aid to the blind.....	46.58	46.69	45.73		
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled.....	44.94	44.97			
General assistance.....	49.74	47.80	48.73		

¹ Continental United States only. Estimated by the Bureau of the Census, except as noted. Monthly employment figures represent specific week and annual figures, average week (unemployment insurance data represent pay period instead of week).

² Estimated by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. Data for March and April 1951 not available.

³ Data from the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor.

⁴ Data from the Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce. Continental United States, except for employees' income, which includes pay of Federal civilian and military personnel in all areas.

⁵ Civilian and military pay in cash and in kind, other labor income (except workmen's compensation), mustering-out pay, terminal-leave pay, and Government contributions to allowances for dependents of enlisted personnel. Excludes employee contributions under social insurance and related programs.

⁶ Payments to recipients under the 4 special public assistance programs and general assistance.

⁷ Includes old-age and survivors insurance benefits; railroad, Federal, State, and local retirement benefits; veterans' pensions and compensation; workmen's compensation; State and railroad unemployment insurance and temporary disability benefits; and readjustment allowances to veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

⁸ Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Includes payments under the Government life insurance, national service life insurance, and military and naval insurance programs, the Government contribution to nonprofit organizations, business transfer payments, and recoveries under the Employer's Liability Act for railroad workers and seamen.

⁹ Benefit in current-payment status is subject to no deduction or only to deduction of fixed amount that is less than the current month's benefit.

¹⁰ Monthly amounts, gross; annual amounts adjusted for voided benefit checks and benefit refunds.

¹¹ Program initiated October 1950.

Policies for the Use of Federal Child Welfare Funds

by MILDRED ARNOLD*

THE 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act authorized the appropriation of increased Federal funds for child welfare services. To help guide the States in planning for the expanded services thus made possible, the Children's Bureau needed to develop new policies. As a first step, the Bureau held four regional conferences between October 2, 1950, and January 5, 1951, with representatives of State welfare departments, other public agencies, and voluntary agencies and also held a national conference with representatives of national voluntary organizations concerned with the child welfare programs.

The purpose of these conferences was to consider the needs of children for child welfare services, whether under public or voluntary auspices; the problems confronting public and voluntary agencies in meeting these needs; and the main points that ought to be covered in the policies to be adopted by the Children's Bureau for the guidance of the States and the Bureau's child welfare representatives in developing plans for the use of the increased funds.

On the basis of the discussions at the four regional conferences and the conference of national voluntary agencies, the Children's Bureau developed a policy manual¹ to guide the States in planning for the use of the additional Federal funds provided by the Congress.

The 1950 law made four revisions in the Federal child welfare provisions:

1. The total amount of Federal funds authorized annually for child welfare services was increased from \$3.5 million to \$10 million.

2. The flat amount available to each State was changed from \$20,000 to \$40,000 annually.

3. The basis for allotment of the balance of the Federal funds was changed from rural population to rural population under age 18.

4. Authorization was provided to use Federal child welfare services funds "for paying the cost of returning any runaway child who has not attained the age of sixteen to his own community in another State in cases in which such return is in the interest of the child and the cost thereof cannot otherwise be met."

The following proviso was also added: "Provided, that in developing such services for children the facilities and experience of voluntary agencies shall be utilized in accordance with child-care programs and arrangements in the States and local communities as may be authorized by the State."

To realize the intent of these amendments, the Children's Bureau wished to develop new policies concerning personnel, professional education, foster care of children, return of runaway children, and community organization and planning in rural areas and areas of special need.

In general, regulations and policies in force for the use of Federal child welfare services funds have been broad and allow the States wide latitude in developing plans. The act provides that such plans shall be developed jointly by the State agency and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency. One specific requirement in the regulations, however, limited the use of Federal funds for maintenance of children in foster care; funds could be used only for temporary care in boarding homes or "projects for care in such homes for special groups of children to meet particular needs."

Now that the Bureau faced the necessity of revising old policies—and

issuing new ones—how could it go about the task of building the broad, sound base so essential to children's services, how could it be sure that these expanded services would meet the needs of children in communities in all parts of the Nation? The Bureau needed the help of many persons, particularly those who would carry the main responsibility for the expanded programs. The five conferences were planned to bring these workers together to help with the task.

Out of these discussions, the Bureau hoped, would come important guides to broad, sound policies on which the expanded programs could be built.

Regional Conferences

The plan for each of the four regional conferences included, for the first 2 days, meetings of the Children's Bureau personnel with representatives of the State welfare agencies—the agencies responsible for the development and administration of the child welfare programs under the Social Security Act. These meetings were conducted in an informal fashion. The agenda for the conferences were developed by the conferees themselves, each conference dividing itself into small groups to bring out the questions to be discussed. As a result, there were some variations in the discussions in each of the four conferences, though at the same time there was a striking similarity in the topics selected.

Certain significant trends were apparent in the discussion. There was general advocacy of the full use of all resources and interests under both public and voluntary auspices, and recognition of the need for more and better community planning to assure the expansion of child welfare programs on a sound and effective basis. It was recognized that such planning should be so organized that it would enlist the effective participation of representatives from voluntary agen-

* Director, Division of Social Services, Children's Bureau.

¹ Policy Manual for the Use of Federal Child-Welfare Services Funds, April 9, 1951.

cies, public agencies, and citizen's groups.

Priorities in the Child Welfare Program

All the regional conferences stressed the importance of community planning in the establishment of new services and in the extension and strengthening of existing services. All community resources and interests, under both public and voluntary auspices, should be utilized in programs of social services for children and youth.

A high priority was also placed on the development of a balanced program with a wide variety of social services and facilities to meet the needs of children and youth. In such programs, particular attention should be given to services for strengthening family life and helping children in their own homes. More adequate coverage of social services for children and youth is needed if these services are to be available in geographic areas now without such services and in areas with only limited services. Obviously, too, the development of personnel with the necessary skills and knowledge must have a high priority if these objectives are to be achieved.

Increased research in child welfare was also urged by the conferees, who realized the need for research as a tool in community planning and as an aid in evaluating the effectiveness of present methods, techniques, and organization.

A Comprehensive Program

Each of the regional conferences discussed briefly the proper scope and content of State child welfare programs and accepted as a basic premise that "children who need services are found in all economic, social and ethnic groups, and services should, therefore, be available to all children needing them regardless of their economic or social status."

The focus of a program should always be on the child and his needs. Children have a wide variety of problems that call for social services and for the resources and facilities that are essential to meet their needs.

The conferees emphasized the urgent need for certain aspects of services in child welfare programs, whether under public or private aus-

pices—early recognition of problems; strengthening home life for children; provision of skilled service; helping children individually or in groups to meet social problems through professional services and adequate resources to meet needs; and preventive work in eliminating hazards and causes of social problems through community planning.

Adequate legislation, sound organization, and adequate funds were considered necessary for effective services to children.

Community Planning

The conferees recognized the need for community planning to (1) bring about better understanding of programs and services and to obtain citizen support; (2) achieve inter-agency cooperation; (3) promote effective utilization of all existing resources, under both voluntary and public auspices, and encourage the expansion of such services when necessary; (4) promote a multidisciplinary approach in developing services and in meeting the problems of children; (5) gear social services for children into differing cultures and practices; and (6) help citizens fulfill their responsibilities in a democracy.

Community planning in child welfare programs is not new. It has always been an important part of these programs. But too often the planning has been piecemeal and sometimes after the fact.

The possible structure and organization for effective State and community planning was discussed at some length. Because of the differences in size, type, and stages of development among the States, as well as among the local communities, flexibility in structure was recognized as essential. Plans should be made for the training and utilization of personnel with special knowledge and skill in community planning to assist States and local communities.

The conferees felt that the experience and interest of groups that had participated in the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth would be an important source of strength for community planning. To prepare for that Conference, State committees had been designated or

appointed in every State and Territory. They reviewed State-wide needs and submitted a report to the Conference. Community-planning groups had also been organized in at least a thousand counties. These planning groups represented widely different groups—professional and citizen—in the population, and both voluntary and public agencies.

Planning is now well under way for a follow-up program of the White House Conference. Planning committees in every State, and a national citizens' committee—all under voluntary and not governmental auspices—are being set up to stimulate and coordinate follow-up efforts. Provision is being made for an advisory council on State and local action and an advisory council of national voluntary organizations, for liaison with the Federal Government.

How can a general planning committee, such as that for the White House Conference, be used in planning for an expanded child welfare program?

The general consensus was that planning for children is everybody's concern. Not only do public and voluntary agencies share responsibility in community planning, but citizens too should participate. To be effective, community planning for child welfare services should be both continuous and comprehensive; it should be State-wide as well as local. It is not enough to develop some initial plan through a representative meeting and let it go at that. The planning must be a continuing process that is capable of adaptation to changing conditions.

Research

Two types of research were discussed at the four regional conferences—basic research, which relates to the study of child growth and development, and operational research, which relates to methods of doing the job.

The conferees held that research, including fact-finding, is an essential tool in effective community planning. Skill in evaluating the services provided, including processes and methods, and in discovering the unmet needs of children, should be improved. Cooperative research on a regional

basis might be possible, and national leadership in planning research is one of the great needs. Because of its special responsibility for assembling facts and information on child life, the groups advocated that the Children's Bureau give more leadership in this important field.

Use of Child Welfare Funds

For its child welfare program, each State receives a flat sum from the Federal Government; in addition, it shares in the balance appropriated for this purpose for the Nation according to the proportion of its rural population under age 18 to the total rural population under that age.

The groups recommended that the Children's Bureau consider changing the definition of rural areas. A rural area has been defined as a county in which more than 50 percent of the population live in nonurban places, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, or as a county that has less than 50 percent of its population living in nonurban places but that does not have a city of 10,000 or more population according to the 1940 census.

Several possible ways of defining a rural area were suggested, including (1) developing areas on a district basis rather than on a county basis; (2) defining the area on the basis of where children live who are receiving services; and (3) raising the limitations on the size of a city within a rural area from the present definition of 10,000 population to one of 20,000 or 50,000.

The conferences also wanted clarification of the definition of an area of special need, particularly with respect to the requirement that Federal funds be used in such areas for developing State services for the "encouragement and assistance of adequate methods of community child-welfare organization."

The conferees discussed at length how Federal funds might be used so that they would not lessen or supplant State or local funds already appropriated for the child welfare programs. There was general agreement that Federal funds should not be substituted for funds already available but that, in keeping with the purpose of the Social Security Act, they should be used for establishing new services

or for extending and improving existing services to children.

Personnel

The groups agreed that social services to children cannot be extended and strengthened unless skilled, professionally trained personnel are available. In staffing the programs, States are faced with a variety of problems, such as an insufficient supply of trained personnel; the inequality of salaries among States (States that pay low salaries lose competent personnel to States that are able to pay more); difficulties in providing for competent supervision; difficulties in securing and retaining staff for rural areas; and the inability of professional schools to supply enough workers.

Because of the importance and, at the same time, the serious shortage of qualified personnel, the conferences agreed that the development of a long-range plan for the employment, training, and improvement of essential personnel should be given a high priority in the expansion of child welfare programs. When trained persons are not available, only persons with general aptitude and ability who are qualified to obtain professional training should be employed. States have found it unwise to recruit persons who could not acquire the necessary skills or be eligible for professional training.

Skilled supervision was considered vital. How can such supervision be brought closer to local workers, particularly in rural areas? Some States have been developing plans for using a local supervisor for county workers in a district composed of two or three counties. Thus the geographical area and the supervisory load are kept small enough to permit staff meetings, group discussions, and other methods of supervision that give workers the stimulation they so often lack in isolated rural areas. Although State consultation is needed on various aspects of the program, it cannot take the place of local supervision. A plan for the training of supervisors should be part of the long-range training program; it might be set up in cooperation with schools of social work, or other methods of increasing skills in supervision might be used.

The importance of extending and strengthening staff development programs was emphasized in all the conferences. There is great need for broadening and strengthening the skills and techniques of the staff currently employed—especially the skills involved in community planning and organization, in work with children living in groups, and in research.

It was recommended that the Bureau consider the use of Federal funds to extend in-service training programs beyond the public welfare agencies—to training schools for delinquent youth, to probation departments, and to voluntary agencies.

Professional Education

Professional education was a major topic of discussion in all the regional conferences. There was general agreement that programs for professional education in social work for the child welfare staff should be expanded.

One of the basic questions considered was whether professional education should be provided, as at present, through payment of a stipend covering the cost of such education, or whether it should be provided through payment of salary to staff members granted leave for professional education. Young workers who have dependents have great difficulty in using leave for professional education when the stipend is based on the cost of education. For this reason, some provision should be made for the use of Federal funds under either plan. A State agency might then choose the plan it would follow, which should be used uniformly throughout the State. Federal funds, it was agreed, should be used for professional education in a graduate school, but not for undergraduate education.

One serious problem in planning professional education for a greater number of workers arises from the lack of opportunity for field-work placements of students in schools of social work. Policies should permit the use of Federal funds to extend opportunities for field-work placement in cooperation with schools of social work; in this area, State public welfare agencies have a responsibility to cooperate with the schools.

The greater use of field-work placements in juvenile courts, child-care

institutions, day nurseries, and departments of public welfare in rural areas was advocated. This arrangement would facilitate the extension of training opportunities and would benefit both public and voluntary agencies.

Training for specialists other than caseworkers, including staff with skill in group work, research, and community organization, is needed. Other personnel, such as cottage parents, should also receive in-service training—through institutes, workshops, and other methods—as part of the agency's total program of staff development.

Foster Care

All four regional conferences considered the use of the increased Federal funds for the provision of foster care for children through the further development of foster-care services within the public welfare agency and also the use of voluntary agencies for the care of those children who are the responsibility of the public welfare agency. Localities where there are child welfare workers but no funds available for foster care should receive first consideration. The second priority should be given to localities where funds are available but not sufficient to meet the need, and the third, to localities where additional funds would raise the standard or level of care—for example, by increasing boarding home rates, providing clothing, or meeting other needs.

The conferences brought out the need for expanding resources for specialized care, such as detention care, or temporary care preceding long-time placement. The development of foster-family homes for these purposes might meet the need for such resources in rural areas. Considerable interest was expressed in using Federal funds to establish group homes for children with special needs not now being met, such as emotionally disturbed children or children in need of detention. Group homes were thought of as homes caring for a comparatively small number of children—possibly 12 or 15—in contrast to institutions, which usually care for larger numbers of children.

The relationship between public and

voluntary agencies in providing foster-family care or group care on either a temporary or a long-time basis received much attention. A wide variety of arrangements now prevails. The basis for a good relationship between the two types of agency, it was felt, rests in cooperative planning, in relation to both community planning to provide needed services and the ways in which voluntary and public agencies should develop their programs.

The regional conferences recognized that casework service must be assured to every child receiving foster care and that, if the voluntary agency providing the care does not have casework service—most often true for institutions—a plan would have to be made for such service, either through the voluntary agency itself or through the public agency. If such service were provided by the voluntary agency, some kind of cooperative planning would need to be worked out as to the initial decision to place the child and periodic evaluation and review of the child's needs and progress. This area is one of the most difficult and complicated. Certain general guidance is clearly needed from the Federal Government with relation to the use of Federal funds, but, at the same time, there must be a wide variety in State and local patterns of service.

Use of Voluntary Agency for Foster Care

All four regional conferences discussed the use of voluntary agencies in caring for children who are the responsibility of the public welfare agency. Underlying this discussion were concern as to how the needs of individual children could best be met and recognition of the fact that public and voluntary agencies have a contribution to make.

The discussion brought out the wide variations in the arrangement under which voluntary agencies now provide care for children for whom the public agencies have responsibility. Some voluntary agencies do not receive, and do not wish to receive, any public funds for the care of children. Others have long had a pattern of providing care on a purchase basis.

That the public agency should have continuing responsibility for the chil-

dren for whom it purchases care and that it should not be merely a disbursing agency was generally recognized. What is meant by "continuing responsibility" was discussed at all four conferences. The following responsibilities of the public agency were then delineated:

- (1) Study and determination of the needs of the individual child; (2) decision as to how the child's needs can best be met; if through care offered by a voluntary agency, then selection of the voluntary agency best able to provide this care for the particular child; (3) determination as to whether public funds should be used to pay for such care and, if so, in what amount and to cover what part of the care and services; (4) planning for casework services to the child and his family to make sure that they are provided by the public or voluntary agency and that duplication or confusion of services is avoided; (5) periodic evaluation of the child's needs and progress, through reports from the voluntary agency and consultation between the two agencies; and (6) decision as to when care provided by the voluntary agency should be terminated and a different plan made for the child.

Runaway Children

One of the first questions raised in this area was whether the use of Federal funds for the return of runaway children is mandatory under the provisions of the Social Security Act. It was pointed out by the Bureau that these provisions are permissive rather than mandatory.

Do the provisions of the Act with respect to rural areas and areas of special need apply to the use of Federal funds for the return of runaways? Here the answer is "No." The provisions concerning runaways offer State public welfare agencies a real opportunity to base their plan for the child's return on his best interests.

How is a runaway defined? After reviewing the provisions of the Act, the groups accepted the following tentative definition proposed by the Children's Bureau: "A runaway child is defined as a child under the age of 16 who, without consent of his parents, guardian, or other person or agency

who has accepted responsibility for his care and protection through legal or voluntary action, shall leave his home or other place of abode in one State and go into another State." Can abandoned or deserted children be considered runaways? The law apparently does not cover this group of children.

A number of participants asked for further interpretation of the phrase "to his own community"; would this necessarily mean to the child's place of local residence? The problem of determining the child's own community, particularly when his parents, although they had legal residence in one State, have moved to another State, might often be difficult. Which State should pay for the child's care—the State in which the child was found or the State to which he was returned? Actually, the law does not specify which State should pay. But regardless of which State pays for the child's return, both States will be involved in working out plans that are to the best interests of the child. All four conferences emphasized the importance of an adequate social study in determining the plans of care for the child.

Who would be responsible for determining that the return of the child is to his best interest and that the cost cannot otherwise be met? Obviously this responsibility would rest with the agency that made the funds available.

Several participants asked what would be done with the child while the social study and plan were being completed. Can Federal funds for the return of runaways be used to cover the costs of care for the child during this period? The law does not permit the use of the funds for this purpose, but Federal funds for child welfare services in rural areas and, under certain conditions, in areas of special need may be used to provide emergency or detention care.

Are Federal funds to be used only for the transportation of the child being returned? Can these funds also be used for the fare and services of an escort for the child if needed? Although the reports of the congressional committee do not indicate the intent of Congress in this respect, the

Children's Bureau believes that Federal funds may be used for an escort as well as for the transportation and incidental expenses for the return of the child.

Some of the groups asked whether runaway children would need to be brought before the courts when Federal funds were used. The consensus was that runaway children can be referred directly to the public welfare agency without requiring referral to the court, though many States include running away in the statutory definition of delinquency.

Role of Voluntary Agencies

Throughout the discussions in the four regional conferences, the important role of the voluntary agencies in the total program of social services to children was recognized. Because of their long experience, these agencies can make a rich contribution in the total community planning for child welfare. Public agencies, in carrying out their responsibilities, can profitably use the voluntary agencies' knowledge of costs of services and care and their established media for interpretation. The cooperation of voluntary agencies in legislative programs for establishing and strengthening child welfare services has proved extremely valuable in many States.

Because of the importance of assuring the fullest possible consideration of the resources of voluntary agencies, especially in view of the proviso added by the 1950 amendments, each regional conference gave particular attention to the ways in which the two types of agency could reinforce each other. In addition, public and voluntary agencies share the responsibility for ensuring that adequate provisions are developed for meeting the needs of children.

There are many ways in which the experience and resources of voluntary agencies may be used in child welfare programs. The agencies can participate with public agency representatives and citizens in broad community planning and in working on particular problems in individual communities, through interagency committees; serve on advisory committees of State and local public welfare agencies; provide consultation to public welfare

agencies on matters affecting the welfare of children; participate in joint staff meetings of public and voluntary agencies to discuss common problems; and serve on official policy boards of public agencies.

Role of Other Public Agencies

The important role of public agencies, such as training schools for delinquent youth and the juvenile courts, in providing social services to children and youth was recognized at all four regional conferences. Safeguards as to the quality of service and coordination of the programs with other services for children and youth, however, were considered essential.

The use of Federal funds to provide professional education for staff of other public agencies was suggested as a means of improving the services of these agencies. In considering possible plans for the use of Federal funds for this purpose, it was proposed that the State public welfare agency employ staff for the period of professional training, or that it grant scholarships to persons employed by other public agencies.

Two possible plans for using Federal funds for the employment of staff for these agencies were considered—the loan of professional personnel employed by State welfare departments to such agencies; and the granting of funds by the State welfare agency to other public agencies. Since some State laws do not permit one agency to grant funds to another public agency, the consensus seemed to be that the most effective method would be the employment of professional staff by the State welfare agency with (1) joint planning between the agencies involved in meeting the need for additional professional services; (2) the assignment of staff by the State welfare agency; (3) continuing supervision by or consultation with the State welfare agency; and (4) periodic reevaluation of the plan for the use of staff assigned to other public agencies.

Meeting With National Voluntary Agencies

The meeting of the Children's Bureau representatives of the national voluntary agencies followed the re-

gional conferences. The meeting was held to review the discussions and the general suggestions made at the four regional conferences and to give the Children's Bureau an opportunity to secure the advice of the national agencies on the policy statements to be developed for the use of the increased Federal child welfare services funds.

State-Wide Planning

The group spent much time discussing whether consultation on a State-wide basis with broadly representative groups, including representatives of voluntary agencies, public officials, and citizen groups, should be mandatory in setting up the State plan.

Some of the conferees favored a mandatory requirement. The Children's Bureau, they pointed out, is required to have evidence of cooperative planning and must assure itself that there has been such planning and that Federal funds are not used for duplicate services. Since title V of the Social Security Act does not require the development of a comprehensive plan of child welfare services, and since the funds are limited, representative groups should be consulted. Title V is designed, moreover, to encourage experimentation and research, which involves cooperation and consultation, and the decision as to the development of the plan for the use of Federal funds should not be left solely to the States. A final reason that was advanced was the failure of public agencies to take as much leadership in cooperative planning with voluntary agencies as is desirable, and the need for steps to assure such planning.

Others believed that the provision should not be mandatory. They claimed that cooperation can best be achieved on a voluntary basis and that a mandatory requirement might result in routine, ineffective planning. Another reason was their belief that primary responsibility should rest with the States rather than with the Federal Government for cooperative planning within the States. Moreover, since it would be difficult, and in some States impossible, to select individuals on a State basis who were representative of voluntary agencies, it was held that the State plan may have to be

composed of the sum of local plans. A mandatory requirement is unnecessary, it was pointed out, because the Children's Bureau, through joint planning with the States, can review the programs and obtain information as to consultation and cooperative planning; and the Bureau, of necessity, must be assured that a State plan is developed on a sound community organization basis, with consideration of all parts of the program.

The conferees agreed as to the desirability of consultation and cooperative planning with broadly representative groups. The major question was "How can this goal be achieved?" The first alternative considered was continued reliance on joint planning between the Children's Bureau and State agencies, with more emphasis on consultation and cooperative planning. Under the second proposal, the Bureau's policy statement would carry a strong recommendation that there be consultation and cooperative planning. Under the third, consultation and cooperative planning would be made mandatory. The second and third alternatives would require the development of criteria.

The group finally recommended that the Bureau policy include a strong statement as to the desirability of consultation and cooperative planning on a State-wide basis with broadly representative groups. It also recommended that the instructions for submitting plan material contain an outline of information to be included in the plan concerning State and community planning and how the different groups are to be brought into this planning. These recommendations would also apply to local community planning.

How can the Bureau determine that cooperative planning has taken place? The group concluded that it would not be desirable for the Bureau to try to set up definite criteria, but that the States should be encouraged to use various methods of assessing needs and planning to meet needs.

Role of Voluntary Agencies

It was proposed that the Children's Bureau include, in the material prepared for use in developing joint plans with State agencies, suggestions

of areas—recruitment of staff, for example—in which public and voluntary agencies have common objectives and cooperation would be practical.

In considering the possibility of cooperative projects with voluntary agencies, the question was raised as to whether the use of the term "encourage" in relation to such projects might imply a kind of priority to the State departments of welfare. Problems might thus be created in some States where the amount of Federal funds and other funds is so limited that the States would feel that they could not afford to use their funds for cooperative projects. The needs of children and the ways of meeting these needs should be the determining factor in relation to such projects.

Role of Other Public Agencies

In the discussion of cooperative projects in relation to the courts in particular, and at some points to other public agencies within the States, several questions were raised. In view of the limited Federal funds and the great needs in these agencies, is it advisable to undertake such projects?

Because, under the present law, Federal funds must be administered under a merit system, it is necessary to find a way of relating appointments to other public agencies to the merit system and relating the State welfare agency to the services provided by other agencies, not in the sense of dictation of case decisions, but in the sense of providing consultation.

The question was also raised as to whether the Federal funds can go to more than one State agency. There is no State where Federal child welfare services funds have gone to more than one State agency; the Federal Security Agency has interpreted the law to mean that the agency to administer the funds is the State department of public welfare.

Other questions and problems were raised in relation to assignment of staff to other public agencies, such as the courts—whether funds would be spread too thin by trying to cover too many areas of service; whether the court should be built up as an administrative agency by developing expanded casework services; the

"fuzzy" administration that might result from lending workers from the department of welfare to the courts; and, a basic question, the direction in which to move in the building up of services to children.

The group stated that if the courts can establish conditions satisfactory to the administrative agency—the State department of welfare—they should have the service of qualified staff on assignment.

Staff Development

Questions were raised as to what is meant by "staff development." Greater attention to recruitment is needed, it was felt, particularly in the light of the increasing competition for personnel as the mobilization program expands. The need for creative imagination, particularly in the area of training, was noted. The group agreed that experimentation in methods of training on the job was an urgent need, and that such training projects, when feasible and advisable, should be open to staff members of both public and voluntary agencies.

For workers going into rural areas, training should be broadened to give them an understanding of the particular situation in which they will be working—for example, the understanding that is gained by training in rural sociology.

In the consideration of scholarships for professional education, the discussion started with a question as to whether Federal funds were available only to public welfare departments. There was a division of opinion on whether or not scholarships from Federal funds should be granted to workers from the voluntary agencies; a series of reasons was given for each point of view.

In the course of the discussion, it was suggested that, in any cooperative planning of training between public and voluntary agencies, and particularly between public and religious agencies, there should be no interference with the basic philosophy of church-sponsored agencies.

Foster Care

The group agreed that, in providing foster care, priority should be given to areas, primarily rural, where

there are neither public nor voluntary facilities for such care or where these facilities do not meet the need. Where voluntary facilities exist to provide the necessary service, the public department should work out cooperative arrangements with the voluntary agency for the care of children for whom the public department is responsible. Duplication of casework service should be avoided; if possible, the basic casework service should be provided by the voluntary agency on the basis of joint planning with the public welfare department. In working out such cooperative arrangements, some of the conferees believed that the public agency should make full payment for the cost of care, though it was noted that the actual cost of service was often difficult to determine.

Public and voluntary agencies should sit down together and determine, community by community, what is public and what is private responsibility. The point was also made that, in many instances, children would not need to be placed in foster homes if basic services were available.

Sometimes voluntary agencies were freer to do experimental work; such demonstration or experimentation should be in consultation with the public agencies.

Some of the serious unmet needs identified by the group in relation to group care included the need for services for after-care of children in training schools for delinquent youth and the need for facilities for Negro children.

In relation to group care, it was agreed that the development of strong basic services in the local community should be emphasized. Since there is such a variety of problems to be met on the basis of community planning, the Children's Bureau should encourage the development of a variety of services through the use of Federal funds.

Is it advisable to use Federal funds to develop group homes for emotionally disturbed children? Certain factors would seem to be against it, such as the limited experience in the use of such homes; the importance of providing highly qualified, specialized

staff; and the high cost of adequate service, which might deter States in using funds in this way.

The members of the group agreed that the policy of the Children's Bureau should be flexible enough to permit experimenting in various types of care, taking into account the problems in different communities and the importance of cooperative planning with other agencies and the necessity for developing basic child welfare services.

Mobilization and Defense

Considerable time was given at the meeting of the national voluntary agencies to the ways in which children would be affected by mobilization and defense activities, the services that ought to be developed to minimize as much as possible the impact of these conditions on child life, and how the opportunities for young people in the teen-age group could be safeguarded. All these questions were considered against a background of increasing urgency.

What are the personnel problems likely to be faced by the child welfare services during this emergency period? It was the sense of the group that child welfare services are essential services, and that, as far as possible, personnel for them should be considered essential. Steps should be taken immediately through appropriate channels to point out the importance of giving special consideration to institutions and other child welfare services in the matter of equipment of various kinds.

The reluctance of the Armed Forces to accept boys for induction who had been residents of training schools or who were on probation should be explored, it was agreed. The ability of these boys to take their place as citizens is of tremendous importance in their rehabilitation.

Standards

The discussion on standards was extremely brief because the time for the conference was running out. The consensus was that standards are primarily the responsibility of the States and local communities, and that they should be worked out cooperatively by

(Continued on page 20)

Income of Aged Persons, 1948

by JACOB FISHER*

DATA from the income-tax returns for 1948, recently furnished the Social Security Administration by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, fill an important gap in available information on the income of aged persons in that year. Under the Revenue Act of 1948, special exemptions of \$600 for age or blindness may be claimed by the taxpayer for himself or for a dependent spouse. The number of returns with special exemptions, arrayed by size of income, are of particular interest because of the clues they offer to the number of aged persons with incomes in the middle- and upper-income brackets. For reasons noted below, the tax returns are not a reliable guide to the number of aged in the lower income groups and tell us nothing about the total number of income recipients among the aged.

The major source of information on the income of the aged in 1948 remains the Bureau of the Census survey of April 1949.¹ The results of this survey, based on interviews conducted in a representative sample of approximately 25,000 households, are summarized in table 1. The income being discussed, incidentally, is money income only. In the Census estimates, the income excludes not only income in kind (value of farm produce consumed by the family, contributions received in the form of food, clothing, and the like, and free shelter), but money receipts as well from the following sources: withdrawals from bank deposits, loans, tax refunds, gifts, lump-sum inheritances or in-

surance payments, and income derived from the sale of assets.

The Bureau of the Census estimates that, among the 11 million persons aged 65 years and over in 1948, about 3.5 million had no money income (as defined) that year and that, of the 7.5 million with money income, about 2.3 million had incomes of less than \$500 and about the same number fell in the class \$500-1,000. There were about 1.4 million persons in the class \$1,000-2,000, about half that number with incomes from \$2,000 to \$3,000, and close to half a million in the class \$3,000-5,000. Perhaps 170,000 had incomes between \$5,000 and \$10,000, and a possible 60,000 had incomes of \$10,000 or more (table 1).

How does an income distribution based on the tax returns with a special exemption compare with the distribution developed by the Bureau of the Census? Before an answer is attempted, the limitations of the income-tax return as a source of information on the income of the aged should be looked at.

To begin with, not all income is reported to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Fewer than half the income recipients among the aged in 1948 filed income-tax returns for that year, to judge from the fact that special exemptions for age or blindness were claimed in about 3.4 million returns only (table 2). The half or more of the aged income recipients who did not file an income-tax return were all or nearly all in the low-income brackets. They included persons all or most of whose income was derived from the following tax-exempt sources, which bulk large in the income pattern of the aged:

(1) Gross income from taxable sources (earnings, dividends, interest, rents, etc.) of less than \$600; (2) old-age assistance and other forms of public assistance; (3) benefit payments under old-age and survivors insurance, the railroad retirement program, and the program for veterans; (4) annuities and pensions (for

that portion representing a return of premiums paid in by the taxpayer); and (5) gifts, bequests, inheritances, and contributions by relatives.

Income derived from these sources is not only exempt from income tax but, except for wage and salary income in item 1, is not reported as income, and hence is not reflected in table 2, among whose 52 million returns are some 16 million with reportable but not taxable income.

A second possible limitation relates to the fact that the special exemption may be claimed for either age or blindness.² The income-tax form contains separate entries for exemptions for age and for blindness, but information is not available on the number falling into each of these groups. The limitation is not serious, however. On the basis of earlier experience with the special deduction of \$500 for blindness of the taxpayer, available in 1947 and earlier years, the Bureau of Internal Revenue is inclined to believe that the number of exemptions for blindness included in the total number of special exemptions is not large. Persons 65 years of age and over outnumber the blind of

* Two exemptions may be claimed by an individual who is both aged and blind. Some idea of the number of such individuals may be obtained by comparing the total number of extra exemptions with the number of extra exemptions in the joint returns of husband and wife. The difference in table 2 between the number of returns with special exemptions and the number of such exemptions is 907,375. This is presumably the number of returns with two exemptions. (Four exemptions could be claimed on one return filed by an aged and blind person who has an aged and blind spouse, but the number of such cases is probably quite small.) The extra exemptions in the 1,968,208 joint returns of husband and wife with special exemptions (table 3) numbered 897,842, nearly all of which may be presumed to represent special exemptions for an aged or blind spouse. The difference between 907,375 and 897,842—about 10,000—may be taken as a rough indication of the number of individuals claiming exemptions for both age and blindness.

* Division of Research and Statistics, Office of the Commissioner.

¹ Bureau of the Census, "Income of Families and Persons in the United States: 1948" (*Current Population Reports, Consumer Income*, Series P-60, No. 6). Additional data from the same survey may be found in the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, *Low-Income Families and Economic Stability* (81st Cong., 1st sess.), 1949. Similar estimates for 1949 appear in the Bureau of the Census report, Series P-60, No. 7.

Table 1.—Persons aged 20 and over and persons aged 65 and over, by money income, 1948

[In thousands]

Money income	Number of persons aged 20 and over	Persons aged 65 and over	
		Number	As percent of persons aged 20 and over
Total number in population ¹	95,910	10,980	11.4
Number of persons without income	30,570	3,490	11.4
Number of persons with income	65,340	7,490	11.5
Less—	260	20	7.7
\$1-499	8,550	2,320	27.1
500-999	8,530	2,260	26.5
1,000-1,499	7,450	930	12.5
1,500-1,999	7,170	510	7.1
2,000-2,499	8,730	460	5.3
2,500-2,999	6,590	280	4.2
3,000-3,999	9,990	350	3.5
4,000-4,999	3,950	130	3.3
5,000-5,999	1,780	80	4.5
6,000-9,999	1,540	90	5.8
10,000 and over	800	60	7.5

¹ Represents estimated civilian noninstitutional population of the United States in April 1949 and includes approximately 393,000 members of the Armed Forces living off post or with families on post.

Source: Estimated from Bureau of the Census, "Income of Families and Persons in the United States: 1948" (Current Population Reports, Consumer Income, Series P-60, No. 6), table 12.

all ages about 40 to 1. It would be reasonable to assume that not more than 2 or 3 percent of the special exemptions were for blindness, although the proportion may have been higher in some income classes.

A third possible limitation concerns the inclusion of joint returns of husband and wife in the count of both the total number of returns and returns with special exemptions. Of the gross total of 52 million returns, 29.7 million or 57 percent were joint returns. Joint returns with special exemptions numbered 1,968,208, or 58 percent of all returns with special exemptions (table 3). The close correspondence in these two proportions suggests that the presence of joint returns in the data introduces no special problem affecting the over-all proportion of returns filed by aged persons.

Most joint returns represent one income split between husband and wife for tax purposes; about 1 in 4, however, to judge by data from the returns for 1943 and 1944 (similar

data are not available for later years), cover the incomes of two income recipients. The relevant consideration is the extent to which the individual incomes in the returns with two incomes, when distributed within the appropriate income classes, would affect the number and proportion of returns with special exemptions—those filed by aged persons—in each income class. It would be reasonable to assume that the effect in general would be to redistribute in lower income classes the individual incomes now merged with those of the spouse and scattered all over the income scale but relatively more frequent in the middle- and upper-income brackets. If the 1-in-4 ratio for double incomes in joint returns can be assumed for joint returns with special exemptions in 1948, then it is likely that there were about 3.9 million aged income recipients represented in the tax returns rather than 3.4 million, and that the 1 million income recipients in the 0.5 million returns with two incomes were located at lower levels on the income ladder than the places the 0.5 million "Individuals" now occupy in tables 2 and 3 by virtue of the additional income of the spouse. In sum, the presence of joint returns in the income-tax data probably results in some overstatement of the income of the aged, but how many are affected and by how much their income is overstated is not known.

Of the three limitations, the first, relating to the nonpresence in the income-tax returns of several million aged persons with low incomes, is the most consequential. Useful comparisons between Census estimates and estimates based on Bureau of Internal Revenue data on the number of aged in specified income classes can be made only for incomes large enough to be reflected in the tax returns. Ordinarily the minimum income for this purpose would be \$600, but because a considerable number of aged persons in the income group \$600-1,000 have income from tax-exempt sources, enumerated earlier, it is advisable perhaps not to compare the estimates for incomes of less than \$1,000. Even in the \$1,000-2,000 class, enough exempt income is prob-

Table 2.—Federal income-tax returns by individuals,¹ taxable and non-taxable, by adjusted gross income classes and by number of special exemptions for age or blindness, 1948

Adjusted gross income	Number of returns	Returns with special exemptions for age or blindness		Number of special exemptions claimed for age or blindness
		Number	Percent of all returns	
Total	82,072,006	3,388,184	6.5	4,296,629
No adjusted gross income	326,309	38,599	11.8	48,435
Under \$500	3,299,919	178,514	5.4	212,196
500-999	4,471,102	468,122	10.5	562,275
1,000-1,499	5,178,887	523,484	10.1	646,210
1,500-1,999	5,966,397	462,513	7.8	366,014
2,000-2,499	6,296,154	404,395	6.4	325,942
2,500-2,999	6,163,236	311,233	5.0	409,843
3,000-3,999	9,396,744	406,789	4.3	327,125
4,000-4,999	5,094,747	197,660	3.9	237,081
5,000-5,999	2,310,295	101,125	4.4	130,909
6,000-6,999	1,162,828	63,973	5.5	82,800
7,000-7,999	590,026	38,496	6.5	50,140
8,000-8,999	354,546	27,086	7.6	36,338
9,000-9,999	245,517	21,049	8.6	27,762
10,000-24,999	955,204	104,076	10.9	138,230
25,000-49,999	185,076	26,640	14.4	35,620
50,000-99,999	52,723	9,588	18.2	12,928
100,000-499,999	15,716	4,002	25.5	5,420
500,000 or more	564	210	37.2	260

¹ Includes joint returns of husband and wife. Source: Preliminary data, Bureau of Internal Revenue, *Statistics of Income for 1948*.

ably received to make the tax returns an unreliable indicator of the incomes of aged persons in this bracket.

The data in tables 1 and 2 indicate that in the income classes between \$1,000 and \$2,500, the Bureau of the Census estimate is consistently larger than an estimate derived from income-tax returns, the difference narrowing as \$2,500 is approached. Beyond this figure the income-tax source yields the larger estimate, the spread between the two estimates increasing with size of income. In the class \$10,000 and more, the estimate to be derived from the tax returns is more than twice as high as the Census estimate.

How are these differences to be interpreted?

Bureau of the Census estimates are based essentially upon the memory of the person interviewed. There is some evidence that persons reporting their income to an interviewer tend to understate income. Occasional earnings, gifts, small dividends, and public assistance payments received for a brief period are likely to be forgotten

a year later. The household member usually interviewed, furthermore, is the housewife, who may confuse take-home pay with total earnings and who sometimes may not be aware of the full amount of her husband's earnings or of other sources of income of which he may be the recipient.

It would be reasonable to conclude that many of the persons in the Census estimate shown in table 1 belong in a higher income bracket than the one in which they have been placed as a result of the survey. A redistribution of the individuals involved, on the basis of more complete information, could conceivably yield larger totals in all the classes beginning with \$1,000 with perhaps no reduction in the size of the group with incomes less than \$1,000, since some of the persons classified by the Bureau of the Census as not in receipt of any money income in 1948 probably had some income in that year, as will be noted later, and belong in the \$1-499 group.

Still another problem is presented by the fact that the Census income distributions are based on a sample of the population and not on a complete census. No matter how carefully a sample is selected, inflation of the

results to yield estimates for the total population inevitably entails some degree of error. The sampling error is particularly large where small numbers are involved. One reason for the increasing disparity at the upper end of the income distribution between Census estimates and income-tax returns is the growth in sampling variability as the number of persons affected declines.

Considerations of a different character are involved in the income-tax data. Aged persons reporting incomes of less than \$1,000 to the Bureau of Internal Revenue represent only a small part of the total number in this class, for reasons cited earlier; the same thing, to a somewhat lesser extent, is true of the group with incomes between \$1,000 and \$2,000. Since the exempt-income sources need not be reported, many individuals are lower in the income scale shown in table 2 than they would be if all income were reportable. As in the case of the Census estimates, therefore, adjustment of the data to reflect income distribution more accurately would necessitate an upward redistribution of the individuals affected. The upward adjustment is appropriate, however, for the lower end of the income scale only.

At the \$2,750 level the number of joint returns of husband and wife (among the group with special exemptions for age or blindness) becomes larger than the number of one-person returns, a situation which calls for a downward adjustment to take account of the double incomes in some of the joint returns. The two adjustments may cancel each other out in the \$2,500-3,500 class, but beyond this interval the net effect of the adjustments is probably in the direction of a lower income classification for the individuals concerned.

If the modifications that seem indicated in the Census estimates and the income-tax data are given effect, a rough picture of the income distribution of aged persons would look somewhat as follows.

Among the 11 million persons aged 65 years and over in 1948, about 3 million³ had no money income, about 2.5 million had money income of less than \$500, and about 2.3 million had money income between \$500 and \$1,000. Income recipients in the class

³The number of persons in the no-income group in the Census estimate is 3.5 million. That the size of this group is overstated becomes evident from an examination of the number of aged persons with income from known sources. According to the Bureau of the Census report, "Work Experience of the Population in 1948" (Current Population Reports, Labor Force, Series P-50, No. 15), 3,460,000 persons aged 65 years and over in December 1948 had some paid employment during the year. In the same month, 1,581,000 aged persons were receiving old-age and survivors insurance, 682,000 were on the benefit rolls of other social insurance and related programs, and 2,495,000 were receiving old-age assistance. After allowances are made for an overlap between old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance equivalent to 10 percent of the insurance beneficiaries and an overlap between all forms of social insurance and employment equal to 10 percent of the insurance beneficiaries, the total number with income from these sources is 7.8 million, or 0.3 million more than the Census estimate of aged persons with income. Since several hundred thousand aged persons must have had money income from other sources only (commercial insurance annuities, industrial pensions, dividends, interest, contributions from friends or relatives) the number with no money income could not have been larger than 3 million and was probably below that figure.

Table 3.—Federal income-tax returns by individuals, taxable and nontaxable, by adjusted gross income classes, joint returns of husband and wife, and number with special exemptions for age or blindness, 1948

Adjusted gross income	All returns			Returns with special exemptions for age or blindness		
	Total	Joint returns of husband and wife		Total	Joint returns of husband and wife	
		Number	As percent of total		Number	As percent of total
Total.....	52,072,008	29,695,806	57.0	3,388,154	1,968,208	58.1
No adjusted gross income.....	326,309	210,961	64.7	38,599	18,647	48.3
Under \$500.....	3,299,919	396,624	12.0	178,514	62,470	35.0
500-999.....	4,471,102	1,061,539	23.7	468,122	173,425	37.0
1,000-1,499.....	5,178,887	1,906,277	36.8	523,484	246,311	47.1
1,500-1,999.....	5,966,397	2,588,124	43.4	462,513	272,959	59.0
2,000-2,499.....	6,296,154	3,197,176	50.8	404,395	266,801	66.0
2,500-2,999.....	6,163,256	3,753,312	60.9	311,233	213,948	68.7
3,000-3,499.....	9,396,744	7,067,034	75.2	406,789	300,594	73.9
3,500-3,999.....	5,094,747	4,313,046	84.7	197,660	144,599	73.2
4,000-4,999.....	2,310,295	2,068,472	89.5	101,125	72,814	72.0
5,000-5,999.....	1,162,828	1,042,331	89.6	63,973	42,423	66.3
6,000-6,999.....	590,026	522,916	88.6	38,496	25,924	67.3
7,000-7,999.....	354,540	309,592	87.3	27,686	18,424	66.5
8,000-8,999.....	248,517	215,409	86.7	21,049	13,913	66.1
9,000-9,999.....	958,204	825,595	86.2	104,076	67,881	65.2
10,000-24,999.....	185,076	159,225	86.0	26,640	17,706	66.5
25,000-49,999.....	52,725	44,920	85.2	9,588	6,506	67.9
50,000-99,999.....	15,716	12,898	82.1	4,002	2,747	68.6
100,000-499,999.....	564	355	62.9	210	116	55.2

Source: Preliminary data, Bureau of Internal Revenue, *Statistics of Income for 1948*.

\$1,000-2,000 numbered perhaps 1.6 million. About three-quarters of a million were in the income class \$2,000-3,000; about half a million in the income class \$3,000-5,000; about 0.2 million in the class \$5,000-10,000; and about 0.1 million had incomes of \$10,000 or more.

Examination of the relative frequency of aged persons in the different income classes indicates that there were somewhat more aged persons in the low-income groups than would be expected from their proportion in the population or among income recipients, and that they constituted a smaller-than-proportionate share of the persons in the middle-income groups. These findings correspond with our general impressions concerning the place of the aged in the country's income structure. What is not generally known, however, is the relatively large place that they occupy in the high-income group.

In 1948 approximately 1 income recipient in 10 was 65 years of age or over. Among persons with incomes of less than \$1,000, however, about 1 in 4 was aged. The ratio dropped to 3 or 4 per 100 in the income classes from \$3,000-4,000 and then rose again. At the \$10,000 level, perhaps 10 in every 100 income receivers were 65 years of age or over; at the \$50,000 level, perhaps 16 in every 100; at the \$100,000 level, perhaps 23 in every 100. Though the high-income aged persons were few in absolute numbers, they comprised an increasing proportion of the total group of recipients in the higher-income brackets.

Census data on living arrangements and studies made by the Social Security Administration of the circumstances of old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries and old-age assistance recipients provide a basis

for some observations concerning the major sources of income in the different income classes.⁴

The 3 million in the "no-income" group included some persons living on withdrawals from savings and sale of assets. More than 9 in 10 were living with related persons and presumably were being supported by them in whole or part. More than 8 in 10 were women, almost half of whom were living with a husband who was probably an income recipient.

Almost half the 2.5 million persons with money incomes less than \$500 were old-age assistance recipients; about one-quarter were old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries. Probably fewer than 10 percent had any income from employment. More than three-fourths were living with related persons and may have been supported in part by them.

Old-age assistance recipients and old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries comprised the bulk also of the 2.3 million persons in the income class \$500-1,000. More than 6 in 10 may have been supported in part by the relatives with whom they were living.

Earners probably outnumbered assistance recipients and old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries among the 1.6 million persons with incomes between \$1,000 and \$2,000. There were more beneficiaries of social insurance and related programs than there were assistance recipients, the reverse of the situation in the

income classes below \$1,000. The number living with relatives was proportionately larger than among persons in the \$500-1,000 class, but probably more of such related persons were dependents rather than sources of support.

At income levels above \$2,000 the relative number of persons with income from employment increased. There was a sharp decline in the number of old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries, and there were no public assistance recipients.

The pattern that may be traced shows, in brief, a shift from complete or almost complete dependence on relatives in the no-income group to support of relatives as income rises; considerable dependence on public assistance income in the very low income brackets and some dependence on this source in the moderately low brackets. Social insurance benefit income bulks large in the moderately low income group and becomes less prominent as one leaves the low income group. At the \$1,000-2,000 level earnings from employment tend to replace relatives, public assistance, and social insurance benefits as a major income source. Considerably further up the income scale—at the \$100,000 level, to judge from the income-tax returns, for persons of all ages, but probably at a lower level for aged persons—income from accumulated assets (dividends, interest, and so on) becomes more important than earnings.

Additional information on the relative importance of these sources of income at various income levels may be available shortly as a result of special tabulations planned by the Social Security Administration from schedules taken by the Bureau of the Census in the course of its postenumeration survey.

⁴ The estimates are based in part on estimates of the incomes of aged old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries and of old-age assistance recipients, prepared by the Social Security Administration for the House-Senate Joint Committee on the Economic Report and published in the Committee's report on low-income families (pp. 11, 12).

Notes and Brief Reports

Old-Age Benefit Awards, 1950

During 1950, old-age benefits were awarded to 567,000 persons, an increase of 68 percent over the previous high established a year earlier. About 46 percent of these persons were "new eligibles"—persons who qualified for old-age benefits solely as a result of the liberalized insured-status provisions in the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act (table 1). Women represented about 28 percent of the new eligibles and 16 percent of the "1939 eligibles."

One-fourth of the awards to 1939 eligibles were to persons who attained age 65 during the year of award; the proportion was slightly higher for women than for men. Some of the persons shown in the table at age 66 reached their sixty-fifth birthday and filed an application for benefits near the end of the previous year, but the award action was not completely processed in that year; thus the number of awards at age 65 may be understated. About 18 percent of the awards to new eligibles were to persons who attained age 65 in 1950, and 19 percent were made to persons who attained age 66. The percentage of new eligibles awarded benefits at the older ages declined steadily, since the liberalization in the insured-status requirements was greatest at age 65 (from 27 quarters of coverage to only 6) and was less at each successive age. For persons reaching their seventy-fifth birthday in the first 6 months of 1950 or in an earlier period, there was no liberalization at all, since these persons needed only 6 quarters of coverage to be fully insured under the 1939 amendments.

The proportion of awards to 1939 eligibles aged 75 or over jumped to almost 16 percent; this age group represented only 9 percent in 1949. The large increase resulted chiefly from the provision in the 1950 amendments that permits beneficiaries aged 75 or over to receive monthly benefits even though they

are earning more than \$50 a month in covered employment. The backlog of these workers has been included in the 1950 awards, so that the proportion of awards to persons aged 75 or over is larger than it is likely to be hereafter.

For persons awarded old-age benefits who were eligible under the 1939 amendments, the average ages were 69.4 years for men and 68.7 years for women, about half a year older in each case than in 1949. These older average ages resulted chiefly from the large number of awards to persons aged 75 or over. About 35 percent of the 1939 eligibles awarded benefits in 1950 were aged 70 or over, an increase over the 31 percent in 1949, but still less than the high of 41 percent set in 1946. For new eligibles,

the average ages were 67.9 years for men and 67.6 years for women. These average ages reflect the larger percentage of awards to newly eligible persons at ages 65-69 and the absence of persons over age 75.

The average old-age benefit award under the 1950 amendments was \$33.24, only \$4.21 more than the average amount awarded under the 1939 amendments (table 2). This low average benefit was due chiefly to the large number of awards to new eligibles, who accounted for two-thirds of the awards under the 1950 amendments and whose average benefit was only \$25.36. The average benefit awarded to 1939 eligibles under the 1950 amendments was \$49.51, about 70 percent more than the average amount awarded under the 1939 amendments. The average benefit amount for women was lower than for men, ranging from \$11 less for

Table 1.—Number and percentage distribution of old-age¹ benefits awarded in 1950 by eligibility status, age, and sex of beneficiary

[Based partly on a 20-percent sample]²

Age of beneficiary ³	Total		Male beneficiaries		Female beneficiaries	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1939 eligibles ⁴	308,417	100.0	258,418	100.0	49,999	100.0
65.....	77,346	25.1	64,328	24.9	13,018	26.0
66.....	50,471	16.4	42,083	16.3	8,388	16.8
67.....	29,553	9.6	24,347	9.4	5,206	10.4
68.....	23,466	7.6	19,276	7.5	4,190	8.4
69.....	18,543	6.0	15,202	5.9	3,341	6.7
70.....	17,328	5.6	14,279	5.5	3,049	6.1
71.....	14,352	4.7	11,875	4.6	2,477	5.0
72.....	11,360	3.7	9,374	3.6	1,986	4.0
73.....	9,018	3.1	7,936	3.1	1,082	3.2
74.....	8,338	2.7	6,942	2.7	1,396	2.8
75-79.....	36,992	12.0	32,567	12.6	4,425	8.9
80 and over.....	11,150	3.6	10,209	4.0	941	1.9
New eligibles ⁵	258,714	100.0	185,410	100.0	73,304	100.0
65.....	47,374	18.3	32,926	17.8	14,448	19.7
66.....	49,301	19.1	34,688	18.7	14,613	19.9
67.....	40,774	15.8	28,261	15.2	12,513	17.1
68.....	36,433	14.1	26,125	14.1	10,308	14.1
69.....	27,646	10.6	19,974	10.8	7,672	10.5
70.....	22,292	8.6	16,603	9.0	5,689	7.8
71.....	15,161	5.9	11,416	6.2	3,745	5.1
72.....	10,269	4.0	7,836	4.2	2,433	3.3
73.....	6,161	2.4	4,835	2.6	1,326	1.8
74.....	2,788	1.1	2,248	1.2	540	.7
75 ⁶	615	.2	498	.3	117	.2

¹ Effective Sept. 1, 1950, under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950, the term "primary insurance benefit" was changed to "old-age insurance benefit."

² Age at birthday in 1950.

³ "1939 eligibles" are persons who had sufficient quarters of coverage to qualify for old-age benefits

under the insured-status provisions in the 1939 amendments.

⁴ "New eligibles" are persons who qualified for old-age benefits solely as a result of the liberalized insured-status provisions in the 1950 amendments.

⁵ Only persons reaching their seventy-fifth birthday during July-December 1950 can qualify as new eligibles.

Table 2.—Number and average monthly amount of old-age¹ benefits awarded in 1950 under the 1939 and the 1950 amendments by eligibility status, age, and sex of beneficiary

[Based partly on a 20-percent sample]

Age of beneficiary ²	Total		Male beneficiaries		Female beneficiaries	
	Number	Average monthly amount	Number	Average monthly amount	Number	Average monthly amount
Under 1939 amendments						
Total.....	183,223	\$29.03	154,450	\$30.16	28,773	\$22.93
65.....	41,860	30.68	34,981	31.94	6,879	24.24
66.....	37,134	30.40	31,367	31.58	5,767	23.97
67.....	19,564	29.92	16,332	31.18	3,232	23.55
68.....	15,500	29.03	13,013	30.23	2,487	22.72
69.....	12,319	28.62	10,270	29.90	2,049	22.21
70.....	11,259	28.18	9,420	29.38	1,839	21.99
71.....	9,237	27.84	7,795	28.92	1,442	21.97
72.....	7,314	27.07	6,149	28.23	1,165	20.94
73.....	6,200	26.55	5,268	27.56	932	20.86
74.....	5,209	26.34	4,442	27.30	767	20.79
75-79.....	13,555	24.98	11,745	25.69	1,810	20.37
80 and over.....	4,072	25.84	3,668	26.20	404	22.65
Under 1950 amendments						
Total.....	283,908	33.24	280,378	35.32	94,530	26.85
65.....	82,860	39.79	62,273	42.51	20,587	31.57
66.....	62,638	31.73	45,404	33.47	17,234	27.14
67.....	50,763	30.01	36,276	32.17	14,487	24.61
68.....	44,399	28.58	32,388	30.29	12,011	23.95
69.....	33,770	27.91	24,906	29.41	8,864	23.68
70.....	28,361	27.78	21,462	29.08	6,899	23.74
71.....	20,276	27.60	15,496	28.76	4,780	23.85
72.....	14,315	27.87	11,061	28.93	3,254	24.27
73.....	9,479	28.72	7,503	29.71	1,976	24.98
74.....	5,917	31.79	4,748	32.94	1,169	27.15
75-79.....	24,052	48.91	21,320	50.20	2,732	38.79
80 and over.....	7,078	50.52	6,541	51.22	537	42.04
1939 eligibles ³	125,194	49.51	103,968	51.37	21,226	40.44
65.....	25,486	52.79	20,347	54.53	5,139	44.43
66.....	13,337	50.14	10,716	52.13	2,621	42.03
67.....	9,989	48.99	8,015	51.28	1,974	39.65
68.....	7,966	47.88	6,263	50.42	1,703	38.54
69.....	6,224	47.54	4,932	49.89	1,292	38.57
70.....	6,069	46.75	4,859	49.07	1,210	37.45
71.....	5,115	45.49	4,080	48.05	1,035	35.40
72.....	4,046	44.88	3,225	47.17	821	35.89
73.....	3,318	43.62	2,668	45.77	650	34.79
74.....	3,129	41.74	2,500	43.89	629	33.18
75-79.....	23,437	49.45	20,822	50.71	2,615	39.43
80 and over.....	7,078	50.52	6,541	51.22	537	42.04
New eligibles ⁴	258,714	25.36	185,410	26.32	73,304	22.93
65.....	47,374	30.06	32,926	31.80	14,448	26.10
66.....	49,301	26.74	34,688	27.70	14,613	24.47
67.....	40,774	25.37	28,261	26.75	12,513	22.24
68.....	36,433	24.36	26,125	25.47	10,308	21.54
69.....	27,546	23.47	19,974	24.36	7,572	21.14
70.....	22,292	22.62	16,603	23.24	5,689	20.82
71.....	15,161	21.57	11,416	21.87	3,745	20.65
72.....	10,269	21.16	7,836	21.42	2,433	20.35
73.....	6,161	20.70	4,835	20.85	1,326	20.17
74.....	2,788	20.64	2,248	20.76	540	20.14
75.....	615	28.09	498	28.94	117	24.49

¹ Effective Sept. 1, 1950, under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950, the term "primary insurance benefit" was changed to "old-age insurance benefit."

² Age at birthday in 1950.

³ "1939 eligibles" are persons who had sufficient quarters of coverage to qualify for old-age benefits

under the insured-status provisions in the 1939 amendments.

⁴ "New eligibles" are persons who qualified for old-age benefits solely as a result of the liberalized insured-status provisions in the 1950 amendments.

⁵ Only persons reaching their seventy-fifth birthday during July-December 1950 can qualify as new eligibles.

1939 eligibles who were awarded benefits under the 1950 amendments to \$3.40 less for new eligibles.

Benefits in Current-Payment Status, State Distribution

The number and amount of old-age and survivors insurance monthly benefits in current-payment status at the end of February 1951, classified by type of benefit and by the State of residence of beneficiary, are shown in the accompanying table. Almost 12 percent of the 3.7 million beneficiaries were in New York State, 9 percent were in Pennsylvania, 8 percent in California, and 6 percent in Ohio and in Illinois. Altogether, these five States accounted for 41 percent of all beneficiaries although, according to the 1950 census, they contained slightly less than 35 percent of the total population of the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii.

At the end of February the Northeastern States had a slightly smaller proportion of the total beneficiaries than before the 1950 amendments were enacted. Apparently, there were proportionately more workers in the Western and Southern States who, because of more limited opportunities for employment covered by the Social Security Act, did not have enough quarters of coverage to be insured under the 1939 amendments but who qualified for benefits because of the liberalization in the insured-status requirements. This trend is evident for all types of benefits but particularly for old-age and wife's benefits. Since the liberalization was applicable only to persons who were living on September 1, 1950, there was a backlog of persons immediately eligible for old-age and wife's benefits, whereas benefits were payable to survivors of newly eligible persons only in event of the worker's death after August 1950.

The average old-age monthly benefit being paid at the end of February ranged from \$48.40 in Connecticut to \$33.50 in Mississippi; the national average was \$43.30. The average bene-

fit was highest in the Northeastern and North Central States, somewhat lower in the far western part of the

country, and lowest in the Southern and South Central States. The lower averages in the Western and

Southern States resulted mainly from the more frequent periods of non-
(Continued on page 27)

Table 1.—Number and amount of monthly benefits¹ in current-payment status² as of February 28, 1951, by type of benefit and by State

Region and State ³	Total		Old-age		Wife's or husband's		Child's		Widow's or widower's		Mother's		Parent's	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total.....	3,706,586	\$134,090,837	1,912,170	\$82,843,755	548,047	\$12,790,358	729,616	\$20,033,906	325,555	\$11,872,233	176,156	\$5,908,761	15,042	\$551,824
Region I.....	342,907	13,249,465	189,565	8,629,088	54,927	1,362,355	47,940	1,402,064	36,069	1,341,046	13,326	474,052	1,080	40,840
Connecticut.....	70,112	2,874,833	38,298	1,853,925	11,377	297,964	9,411	299,362	8,166	316,283	2,632	98,430	228	8,869
Maine.....	33,280	1,160,173	18,382	761,202	5,142	115,773	5,613	142,633	2,753	96,018	1,277	40,525	113	4,022
Massachusetts.....	177,378	6,918,290	98,445	4,508,207	28,479	712,945	23,914	714,118	18,868	704,546	7,117	257,238	555	21,236
New Hampshire.....	20,346	731,979	11,547	489,000	3,141	72,560	3,088	82,206	1,827	63,643	691	22,693	52	1,817
Rhode Island.....	30,599	1,178,787	17,088	775,840	5,027	123,921	3,889	112,687	3,369	123,084	1,125	39,497	101	3,758
Vermont.....	11,192	385,403	5,805	240,914	1,761	39,192	2,025	51,018	1,086	37,472	484	15,669	31	1,138
Region II.....	929,469	35,850,623	495,806	22,561,830	143,098	3,524,317	145,625	4,416,483	97,513	3,625,591	43,466	1,581,028	3,961	150,374
Delaware.....	8,649	326,412	4,622	204,709	1,260	30,941	1,486	43,448	900	33,384	333	12,162	48	1,768
New Jersey.....	150,817	5,997,836	80,277	3,761,213	24,165	613,497	22,198	707,716	17,209	654,537	6,344	236,587	624	24,286
New York.....	435,458	16,740,005	241,318	10,795,443	66,099	1,613,174	62,096	1,899,407	45,077	1,666,490	19,004	694,013	1,864	71,478
Pennsylvania.....	334,545	12,795,370	169,589	7,800,465	51,574	1,260,705	59,845	1,765,912	34,327	1,271,180	17,785	638,266	1,425	52,842
Region III.....	240,950	7,858,589	103,366	4,247,489	28,701	622,003	73,266	1,803,049	18,036	626,269	16,204	512,298	1,377	47,391
Dist. of Col.....	13,032	500,722	7,108	304,929	1,583	37,678	3,003	79,120	1,448	52,642	740	24,520	50	1,833
Maryland.....	51,983	1,876,704	25,344	1,092,017	6,784	160,567	11,365	320,492	5,381	194,665	2,846	99,360	263	9,603
North Carolina.....	60,828	1,747,790	23,598	877,690	6,643	128,221	22,017	487,944	3,661	115,534	4,530	126,175	379	12,256
Puerto Rico.....	270	8,549	56	2,373	7	182	136	3,513	8	331	46	1,469	17	672
Virgin Islands.....	29	851	13	519	3	71	9	130	3	107	1	24	0	0
Virginia.....	58,363	1,854,833	24,779	996,238	6,754	143,694	18,230	432,908	4,368	150,452	3,859	118,969	373	12,572
West Virginia.....	55,545	1,809,149	22,468	973,753	6,927	151,680	18,506	478,942	3,167	112,538	4,182	141,781	295	10,455
Region IV.....	455,575	16,857,256	224,274	9,994,987	69,732	1,672,573	95,389	2,744,048	42,327	1,589,827	22,242	794,888	1,611	60,933
Kentucky.....	57,188	1,757,043	24,040	940,564	7,219	144,503	18,035	417,789	3,673	125,372	3,873	116,837	342	11,978
Michigan.....	162,916	6,200,496	79,810	3,623,403	24,441	599,428	34,826	1,071,153	15,140	578,556	8,207	308,729	492	19,217
Ohio.....	235,471	8,899,727	120,418	5,431,030	38,072	928,642	42,528	1,255,106	23,514	885,899	10,162	369,322	777	29,738
Region V.....	486,690	17,977,918	256,877	11,210,878	76,167	1,792,265	86,178	2,523,852	45,639	1,672,795	20,189	716,161	1,640	61,967
Illinois.....	234,344	8,955,105	124,498	5,615,292	35,482	863,823	40,565	1,228,341	23,179	860,598	9,705	351,697	915	35,354
Indiana.....	107,311	3,800,277	55,212	2,321,744	17,115	387,346	20,717	586,151	9,544	340,941	4,393	151,962	330	12,133
Minnesota.....	59,260	2,107,659	31,863	1,336,496	9,343	212,262	10,492	289,382	4,821	176,014	2,594	88,075	147	5,430
Wisconsin.....	85,775	3,114,877	45,304	1,937,346	14,227	328,834	14,404	419,978	8,095	295,242	3,497	124,427	248	9,060
Region VI.....	291,594	8,876,974	129,891	5,019,603	36,103	738,986	88,062	1,950,306	16,740	553,709	18,911	542,620	1,887	62,750
Alabama.....	53,914	1,563,185	21,802	813,275	6,129	116,768	18,541	407,620	2,863	91,672	4,193	120,911	386	12,939
Florida.....	78,950	2,798,232	43,965	1,878,092	12,821	298,607	14,150	350,800	4,680	164,709	3,086	97,637	248	8,387
Georgia.....	52,559	1,508,186	21,342	780,697	5,488	106,712	18,460	401,988	3,135	101,353	3,708	103,399	426	14,037
Mississippi.....	22,501	599,833	9,265	310,856	2,870	44,108	7,707	189,443	1,053	32,444	1,686	45,749	220	7,233
South Carolina.....	30,912	848,960	10,710	397,690	2,868	55,028	12,747	264,329	1,773	56,754	2,595	67,952	219	7,207
Tennessee.....	52,738	1,558,578	22,807	838,993	6,227	117,703	16,457	375,126	3,236	106,777	3,643	106,972	388	12,947
Region VII.....	200,176	7,005,816	112,142	4,416,843	33,470	708,686	36,881	972,522	17,502	606,065	8,402	273,594	779	28,106
Iowa.....	48,978	1,604,206	26,140	1,003,957	8,188	169,233	8,472	223,976	4,103	139,654	1,922	61,942	153	5,444
Kansas.....	36,337	1,167,418	19,229	728,441	6,122	122,455	6,730	176,451	2,632	87,036	1,510	49,140	114	3,895
Missouri.....	90,996	3,187,023	49,432	2,035,248	14,027	314,257	15,329	408,586	8,314	208,253	3,488	115,622	406	15,057
Nebraska.....	20,426	680,387	11,089	417,952	3,344	67,256	3,466	92,255	1,640	54,192	823	26,511	64	2,221
North Dakota.....	5,301	161,627	2,694	97,296	727	13,986	1,245	29,828	302	9,988	308	9,658	25	871
South Dakota.....	7,138	225,155	3,558	133,949	1,062	21,499	1,639	41,426	511	16,942	351	10,721	17	618
Region VIII.....	225,200	6,890,852	102,077	3,810,165	27,726	539,680	66,743	1,623,876	12,824	429,150	14,732	449,730	1,098	38,251
Arkansas.....	28,348	789,040	13,460	461,579	3,847	66,036	7,866	168,021	1,361	41,710	1,634	45,656	180	6,038
Louisiana.....	42,124	1,290,768	18,957	709,619	4,803	94,997	12,441	295,300	2,650	80,739	3,001	91,594	272	9,519
New Mexico.....	7,858	230,733	2,975	112,080	771	15,184	3,100	72,525	329	11,140	648	18,564	35	1,240
Oklahoma.....	36,298	1,133,871	17,653	659,128	4,921	96,471	9,604	243,309	1,958	66,467	2,048	64,438	114	4,058
Texas.....	110,572	3,446,440	49,032	1,867,759	13,384	266,992	33,732	844,721	6,526	220,094	7,401	229,478	497	17,396
Region IX.....	69,679	2,377,303	35,711	1,445,812	10,081	218,083	15,721	426,990	4,766	172,021	3,173	106,004	227	8,398
Colorado.....	29,043	1,009,959	15,396	635,416	4,472	99,133	5,752	154,742	2,148	77,713	1,229	40,221	76	2,734
Idaho.....	11,008	350,592	5,838	218,181	1,521	29,808	2,624	68,632	544	18,314	444	14,216	37	1,351
Montana.....	11,891	410,272	6,300	252,396	1,570	34,155	2,525	69,491	929	34,518	508	17,480	59	2,232
Utah.....	13,130	445,856	5,670	236,305	1,929	42,289	3,788	105,201	806	32,728	802	27,658	45	1,677
Wyoming.....	4,607	160,624	2,537	103,514	969	12,608	1,032	28,924	249	8,750	190	6,429	10	399
Region X.....	440,601	16,554,325	254,730	11,133,578	65,458	1,547,523	72,001	2,110,980	32,476	1,194,726	14,790	523,731	1,146	43,787
Alaska.....	1,779	62,576	1,061	43,441	73	1,800	538	14,026	42	1,497	59	1,910	6	142
Arizona.....	14,536	500,172	6,814	287,605	1,795	41,080	4,217	111,861	709	28,129	882	29,328	59	2,169
California.....	293,698	11,156,890	171,565	7,531,549	43,840	1,048,423	45,336	1,365,239	22,628	838,272	9,553	343,504	776	29,873
Hawaii.....	8,849	285,316	4,297	172,224	902	18,220	2,689	63,311	380	13,151	560	17,635	21	775
Nevada.....	3,606	132,059	2,121	88,118	326	7,389	818	23,945	206	7,064	124	4,513	11	430
Oregon.....	47,050	1,716,706	27,182	1,160,792	7,399	168,105	7,701	220,103	3,184	112,481	1,466	50,713	118	4,512
Washington.....	71,083	2,700,636	41,690	1,849,849	11,123	262,746	10,702	312,495	5,267	193,532	2,146	76,128	155	5,886
Foreign.....	14,745	582,718	7,731	373,482	2,584	63,797	1,810	50,716	1,063	61,034	721	24,655	236	9,032

¹ Effective Sept. 1, 1950, under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950: (1) husband's and widower's insurance benefits became payable; (2) the terms "primary insurance benefit" and "widow's current insurance benefit" were changed to "old-age insurance benefit" and "mother's insurance benefit," respectively.

² Benefit in current-payment status is subject to no deduction or only to deduction of fixed amount that is less than the current month's benefit.

³ Beneficiary's State of residence as of February 28, 1951.

Recent Publications*

Social Security Administration

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE. DIVISION OF TECHNICAL TRAINING. *The Work of the Full-Time Training Supervisor in State Public Assistance Agencies.* Washington: The Bureau, Jan. 1951. 53 pp. Processed.

Describes the activities of 23 supervisors in 19 State agencies and summarizes data on their qualifications and salaries. Limited free distribution; apply to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU. *Policy Manual for the Use of Federal Child-Welfare Services Funds.* Washington: The Bureau, Apr. 1951. Unpaged. Processed.

Conditions under which grants may be made and policies for their use. Limited free distribution; apply to the Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

FRIEDSON, ABE, and ZISMAN, JOSEPH. *Nineteen Employee-Benefit Plans in the Airframe Industry.* (Bureau Memorandum No. 71.) Washington: Division of Research and Statistics, 1951. 63 pp. Processed.

This study, the third in a series, analyzes the employee-benefit plans in 19 industries employing approximately 154,000 workers. Limited free distribution; apply to the Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

General

"Agricultural Social Insurance in France." *Industry and Labour*, Geneva, Vol. 5, April 15, 1951, pp. 303-307. 25 cents.

Analyzing Social Problems. John Eric Nordskog; Edward C. McDonagh; and Melvin J. Vincent, editors. New York: The Dryden Press, 1950. 818 pp. \$4.25.

A compilation of 104 papers, organized for use as a textbook.

ASSOCIATION OF CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANIES. DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH. *Government Insurance in*

the United States: A Special Study. New York: The Association, 1950. 130 pp.

Includes chapters on Federal workmen's compensation; retirement and disability provisions for Federal employees; old-age and survivors and unemployment insurance; the railroad retirement, unemployment, and disability programs; and State cash sickness disability insurance.

BURNHAM, PAUL S., and PALMER, STUART H. *Counseling in Personnel Work: 1945-1949; An Annotated Bibliography.* (Publication No. 105.) Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1951. 39 pp. \$1.

References on employee, occupational, rehabilitation, student, and veteran counseling.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY ASSOCIATION. *Ninth General Meeting, Rome, 3 to 8, October 1949; Proceedings; Reports and National Monographs; Resolutions and Conclusions.* Geneva: International Labor Office, 1950. 665 pp. \$2.50.

Includes reports on recent developments in the field of social security, programs to protect mothers and children, and financing.

McHENRY, DEAN E. "The New Zealand System of Social Security." *Social Service Review*, Chicago, Vol. 25, Mar. 1951, pp. 48-59. \$1.75.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY. INSTITUTE OF LABOR RELATIONS AND SOCIAL SECURITY. *Current Issues in Social Security.* Lois MacDonald, editor. New York: The Institute, 1951. 147 pp.

Includes Fifteen Years Under the Social Security Act: An Evaluation, by Eveline M. Burns; Issues in Unemployment Insurance, by Herman A. Gray; The New York Disability Benefits Law, by Pat Merrick; Voluntary Plans and Cash Disability Laws, by Albert Pike, Jr.; Old Age Retirement: Issues and Outlook, by Robert M. Ball; and A Plan for Compulsory Health Insurance, by Victor J. Sheffer.

TANENBAUM, DAVID E. "The Family Agency as a Community Resource for the Adjustment of Displaced Persons." *Social Service Review*, Chicago, Vol. 25, Mar. 1951, pp. 14-18. \$1.75.

UNITED NATIONS. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INFORMATION. *Yearbook of the United Nations, 1948-49.* New

York: Published by Columbia University Press in cooperation with the United Nations, 1950. 1,171 pp. \$12.50.

Retirement and Old Age

ALBRECHT, RUTH. "The Social Roles of Old People." *Journal of Gerontology*, Baltimore, Vol. 6, Apr. 1951, pp. 138-145. \$2.

Considers the social roles of older people in an average community and shows how these roles are related to their personal adjustment.

FURST, RALPH. "Old Age—A New Frontier." *Public Welfare in Indiana*, Indianapolis, Vol. 61, Mar. 1951, pp. 4-8.

GINZBERG, RAPHAEL, and BRINEGAR, WILLARD C. "Longevity Studies, Length of Life and the Aged Population in Iowa." *Journal of the Iowa State Medical Society*, Des Moines, Vol. 41, May 1951, pp. 174-182.

MARSH, W. LAWRENCE. "Retirement Provisions for Social Workers Re-examined." *Social Work Journal*, New York, Vol. 32, Apr. 1951, pp. 84-87. \$2 a year.

The major considerations for both agencies and social workers in acting on social security coverage.

Employment

DUNCAN, WILLIAM. "The Vocational Guidance and Employment of Handicapped and Disabled Young People." *Occupational Psychology*, London, Vol. 25, Jan. 1951, pp. 56-63. 5s.

The program of the Liverpool Youth Employment Bureau described by the Bureau's superintendent.

GODINE, MORTON ROBERT. *The Labor Problem in the Public Service: A Study in Pluralism.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951. 305 pp. \$5.

Analyzes labor problems in the civil service and considers the role of employee organizations in securing improvements in conditions of employment.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR OFFICE. *Manpower Problems, Vocational Training, and Employment Service.* (Regional Conference for the Near and Middle East, Teheran, April 1951, Report I.) Geneva: The Office, 1951. 46 pp. 25 cents.

Considers manpower problems in relation to the problems of economic development.

MARKS, RACHEL. "Effects of Early

* Prepared in the Library, Federal Security Agency. Orders for the publications listed should be directed to publishers or booksellers; Federal publications for which prices are listed should be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Workmen's Compensation Legislation on the Employment of the Handicapped, 1897-1915." *Social Service Review*, Chicago, Vol. 25, Mar. 1951, pp. 60-78. \$1.75.

THOMAS, ROBERT W. *Workmen's Compensation in New Mexico: A Comparative Analysis*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, Department of Economics, 1950. 179 pp. Processed.

Evaluates the New Mexico law and contrasts it with the Arizona Workmen's Compensation Act and with ideal legislation.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS. *Résumé of the Proceedings of the Seventeenth National Conference on Labor Legislation, November 29, 30, and December 1, 1950.* (Bulletin No. 141.) Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 59 pp.

Includes committee reports on training, industrial safety and health, and special problems of women and young workers.

Public Welfare and Relief

BRANSCOMBE, MARTHA. "The Role of the Private Agency in Community Services." *Public Aid in Illinois*, Chicago, Vol. 18, Feb. 1951, pp. 1-7 f.

Discusses the fundamental differences between public and private services and shows how the role of the private agency is constantly changing.

LINDQUIST, RUTH, and WILKIE, LORA P. *Needs of Persons 60 Years of Age and Over and Services Rendered by the Department of Public Welfare in Warren County, North Carolina.* (Research Publication No. 1.) Raleigh: North Carolina State Board of Public Welfare, Research and Statistical Service, Nov. 1950. 60 pp. Processed.

REYNOLDS, BERTHA CAPEN. *Social Work and Social Living: Explorations in Philosophy and Practice*. New York: Citadel Press, 1951. 176 pp. \$2.50.

The author describes her experience as a social worker for the National Maritime Union during World War II.

STEWART, MAXINE G. "The Economic Status of Social Workers, 1950." *Social Work Journal*, New York, Vol. 32, Apr. 1951, pp. 53-62. \$2 a year.

Discusses the social worker's salary, supplemental benefits, education, and experience.

Twentieth Anniversary Review of the

Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation. New York: Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation, 1950. 110 pp.

Traces the development of the Foundation's programs, which consist mainly of grants-in-aid in medical research and medical education.

WHITE, R. CLYDE. *Administration of Public Welfare.* (2d ed.) (American Sociology Series.) New York: American Book Company, 1950. 546 pp. \$4.50.

Maternal and Child Welfare

CALIFORNIA. LEGISLATURE. SENATE INTERIM COMMITTEE ON STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION. *Report . . . Aid to Needy Children Program of the State of California.* Sacramento: The Senate, 1951. 84 pp.

Includes recommendations for changes in the statutes relating to aid to needy children.

FULLER, EDWARD. *The Right of the Child: A Chapter in Social History.* Boston: The Beacon Press, 1951. 159 pp. \$2.

Describes the organization and development of the Save the Children Fund with special emphasis on the work of Eglantyne Jebb, its founder.

"Maternity and Child Welfare in Rural Areas." *International Child Welfare Review*, Geneva, Vol. 5, 1951, pp. 3-19. \$2.50 a year.

Surveys the maternal and child welfare services in 15 countries having a relatively low rate of infant mortality.

MIHANOVICH, CLEMENT S. *Principles of Juvenile Delinquency.* Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1950. 138 pp. \$2.

Analyzes the problem of juvenile delinquency and considers its causes and ways of preventing and treating it.

PESSIN, VIVIAN; WALLACE, HELEN M.; and BAUMGARTNER, LEONA. "Medical Care of Maternity Patients Under the Emergency Maternity and Infant Care Program in New York City." *American Journal of Public Health*, New York, Vol. 41, Apr. 1951, pp. 402-409. 70 cents.

SCHOENBERG, CARL. "Long Time Foster Home Care as an Agency Service." *Child Welfare*, New York, Vol. 30, May 1951, pp. 3-6. 35 cents.

Describes situations in which long-time foster-home care is necessary and discusses the problems involved.

WEISENBARGER, RUTH. "Direct Casework With the Child in Foster Home Placement." *Child Welfare*,

New York, Vol. 30, April 1951, pp. 3-6. 35 cents.

Illustrates how the caseworker should help the child in understanding his foster-home experience.

Health and Medical Care

BIXBY, ALDEN F. "Frequency of Sickness Among Railroad Employees, 1949-50." *American Economic Security*, Washington, Vol. 8, Mar.-Apr. 1951, pp. 18-22. 25 cents.

BURNS, EVELINE M. "Income During Disability." *Survey*, New York, Vol. 87, May 1951, pp. 203-205. 50 cents.

Describes the programs providing cash payments during illness in California, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island.

GREAT BRITAIN. CENTRAL OFFICE OF INFORMATION. *Health Services in Britain.* London: The Office, Jan. 1951. 47 pp.

KLEM, MARGARET C. "Amendments to the Social Security Act of Special Importance to Nurses." *Public Health Nursing*, New York, Vol. 43, Apr. 1951, pp. 189-197. 45 cents.

Discusses amendments having medical care implications with special emphasis on the new program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

LEVIN, MORTON L. "Nursing Homes—Their Part in the Community's Attack on Chronic Illness." *Welfare*, Harrisburg, Pa., Vol. 17, Spring Issue 1951, pp. 87-91.

"The New York Disability Benefits System: I. An Appraisal of the New York Disability Benefits Law; II. The Model Approach." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Ithaca, N. Y., Vol. 4, Apr. 1951, pp. 415-438. \$1.25.

STRAUS, ROBERT. *Medical Care for Seamen: The Origin of Public Medical Service in the United States.* New Haven: Published for the Department of Sociology, Yale University, by the Yale University Press, 1950. 165 pp. \$3.75.

Analyzes the development of Federal medical care for American merchant seamen.

TURNER, VIOLET B. *Chronic Illness: Digests of Selected References.* (Public Health Bibliography Series, No. 1.) Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1951. 216 pp. 50 cents.

ZEMAN, FREDERIC D. "The Role of the Professional Nurse in Community Planning for the Aged." *Journal of Gerontology*, Baltimore, Vol. 6, Apr. 1951, pp. 146-150. \$2.

Current Operating Statistics

Table 1.—Selected social insurance and related programs, by specified period, 1940–51

[In thousands; data corrected to June 5, 1951]

Year and month	Total	Retirement, disability, and survivor programs										Unemployment insurance programs				Readjustment allowances to self-employed veterans ¹³	
		Monthly retirement and disability benefits ¹				Survivor benefits						Temporary disability benefits ²		State laws ³	Service-men's Readjustment Act ¹¹		Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act ¹²
		Social Security Act	Railroad Retirement Act	Civil Service Commission ⁵	Veterans Administration	Social Security Act ⁶	Railroad Retirement Act ⁴	Civil Service Commission ⁵	Veterans Administration ⁶	Social Security Act	Other ⁷	State laws ³	Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act ¹⁰				
Number of beneficiaries																	
1950																	
April.....		1,813.3	247.3	152.4	2,358.5	1,075.4	133.4	15.5	981.0	17.2	12.0	30.5	27.7	1,559.4	48.7	91.2	2.1
May.....		1,827.2	249.1	153.9	2,362.9	1,084.4	135.1	16.3	982.9	18.5	12.7	34.5	28.3	1,567.2	36.2	66.9	2.1
June.....		1,839.3	250.7	155.1	2,368.2	1,091.1	136.6	17.1	991.2	18.0	11.5	32.8	26.6	1,588.4	28.9	46.9	2.0
July.....		1,852.9	251.6	155.8	2,343.1	1,093.2	137.6	17.5	995.1	16.0	10.1	31.3	25.5	1,558.2	20.9	45.8	1.7
August.....		1,867.1	252.6	157.4	2,347.6	1,100.0	138.5	18.5	998.2	16.2	11.5	30.1	33.5	1,622.8	21.3	44.7	1.4
September.....		1,917.8	253.6	158.5	2,352.6	1,108.6	139.1	20.3	1,000.7	12.0	9.8	28.3	31.5	1,605.9	12.8	31.7	1.0
October.....		2,062.7	254.3	159.5	2,358.2	1,119.6	140.1	23.5	1,004.7	11.9	10.4	30.7	33.4	1,651.5	7.1	32.6	.7
November.....		2,209.2	255.1	160.0	2,361.7	1,137.0	141.0	24.1	1,007.6	16.7	10.4	28.2	33.9	1,733.7	5.5	30.9	.4
December.....		2,323.0	255.6	160.8	2,365.8	1,154.2	141.7	24.9	1,010.1	19.6	9.5	27.2	32.1	1,832.0	5.8	34.9	.3
1951																	
January.....		2,428.9	256.3	161.8	2,364.9	1,176.4	142.5	25.7	1,000.6	33.0	11.1	29.1	39.3	1,971.7	6.0	50.6	.3
February.....		2,510.6	257.2	162.7	2,365.6	1,196.0	142.8	26.5	1,001.4	30.6	10.3	27.9	38.4	1,983.1	5.0	46.8	.2
March.....		2,589.5	258.1	163.2	2,368.2	1,219.6	143.7	27.4	1,001.4	41.8	11.9	30.2	28.3	1,907.2	3.5	28.7	.2
April.....		2,649.0	259.1	163.9	2,370.8	1,241.0	144.8	28.1	1,005.4	34.4	12.2	31.6	27.3	1,940.2	2.2	27.9	.1
Amount of benefits ¹³																	
1940.....	\$1,188,702	\$21,074	\$114,166	\$62,019	\$317,851	\$7,784	\$1,448	\$105,696	\$11,736	\$12,267				\$518,700		\$15,961	
1941.....	1,085,488	55,141	119,912	64,933	320,561	25,454	1,559	111,799	13,328	13,943				344,321		14,537	
1942.....	1,130,721	80,305	122,806	68,115	325,265	41,702	1,603	111,193	15,038	14,342				344,084		6,268	
1943.....	921,465	97,257	125,795	72,961	331,350	57,763	1,704	116,133	17,830	17,255	\$2,857			79,643		917	
1944.....	1,118,798	119,009	129,707	77,193	456,279	76,942	1,765	144,302	22,146	19,238	5,035			62,385	\$4,113	582	\$102
1945.....	2,065,566	157,391	137,140	83,874	697,830	104,231	1,772	254,238	26,135	23,431	4,669			445,866	114,955	2,359	11,675
1946.....	5,149,761	230,285	149,188	94,585	1,268,984	130,139	1,817	333,640	27,267	30,610	4,761			1,094,850	1,491,294	39,917	252,424
1947.....	4,700,827	299,830	177,053	106,876	1,676,029	153,109	19,283	382,515	29,517	33,115	26,025	\$11,368		776,164	772,368	39,401	198,174
1948.....	4,510,041	366,887	208,642	132,852	1,711,182	176,736	36,011	\$918	413,912	32,315	32,140	35,572	30,843	793,265	426,569	28,599	83,596
1949.....	5,693,462	454,483	240,893	158,973	1,692,215	201,369	39,257	4,317	477,406	33,158	31,771	58,448	30,103	1,737,279	386,635	103,596	43,550
1950.....	5,357,813	717,149	254,240	175,787	1,732,208	301,000	43,884	8,409	491,570	32,740	33,578	71,257	28,099	1,373,426	32,987	59,804	1,666
1951																	
April.....	446,076	41,992	20,462	14,195	147,235	17,647	3,384	588	40,555	2,862	3,028	2,852	2,429	138,968	3,838	5,822	189
May.....	445,447	42,371	20,587	14,332	148,663	17,825	3,430	614	41,065	3,080	3,202	3,331	2,626	136,778	3,185	4,153	206
June.....	423,350	42,712	20,712	14,447	145,906	17,969	3,470	624	41,026	3,016	2,922	3,169	2,387	119,430	2,526	2,848	184
July.....	396,175	43,090	20,772	14,487	139,891	18,035	3,500	655	40,642	2,675	2,661	2,952	2,131	99,718	2,209	2,590	167
August.....	390,504	43,466	20,843	14,861	141,510	18,175	3,530	691	41,207	2,704	2,907	3,062	3,038	89,681	1,988	2,697	144
September.....	411,640	78,886	20,910	15,319	138,403	35,125	3,549	850	41,001	2,021	2,431	2,753	2,796	64,458	1,126	1,917	91
October.....	412,821	82,940	20,963	15,399	141,532	35,413	3,575	899	40,873	1,927	3,013	2,900	3,060	57,533	629	2,102	63
November.....	419,756	87,112	21,016	15,507	138,769	35,815	3,604	927	41,056	2,540	2,804	2,751	3,033	62,389	487	1,906	40
December.....	429,377	90,603	21,060	15,554	139,188	36,254	3,625	953	41,486	2,894	2,496	2,675	2,979	66,969	404	2,145	32
1951																	
January.....	461,639	94,007	21,113	15,825	139,445	36,875	3,647	997	41,642	4,770	2,846	2,974	3,401	90,475	553	3,037	23
February.....	441,934	96,598	21,184	15,815	138,160	37,493	3,658	1,009	41,865	4,314	2,648	2,508	2,350	71,369	391	2,555	17
March.....	449,759	99,041	21,255	15,921	139,140	38,218	3,686	1,006	42,833	5,815	2,998	2,980	2,591	71,884	315	2,360	16
April.....	440,053	100,808	21,334	16,046	138,046	38,829	3,719	1,081	42,832	4,705	3,151	2,957	2,432	62,294	197	1,808	14

¹ Under the Social Security Act, retirement benefits—old-age (primary) benefits, wife's benefits, husband's benefits (first payable Sept. 1950), and benefits to children of old-age beneficiaries—partly estimated. Under the other 3 systems, benefits for age and disability.

² Data for civil-service retirement and disability fund; excludes noncontributory payments made under the Panama Canal Construction Annuity Act to persons who worked on Canal construction 1904–14 or to their widows. Through June 1948, retirement and disability benefits include payments to survivors under joint and survivor elections; beginning July 1948, payments under survivor provisions shown as survivor benefits.

³ Mother's (widow's current), widow's, widower's (first payable Sept. 1950), parent's, and child's benefits. Partly estimated.

⁴ Annuities to widows under joint and survivor elections; 12-month death-benefit annuities to widows and next of kin, and, beginning February 1947, widow's, widow's current, parent's, and child's benefits.

⁵ Payments to widows, parents, and children of deceased veterans.

⁶ Number of decedents on whose account lump-sum payments were made.

⁷ Payments under the Railroad Retirement Act and Federal civil-service and veterans' programs.

⁸ First payable in Rhode Island, April 1943; in California, December 1946; in New Jersey, January 1949; in New York, July 1950 (data not available); and under

the railroad program, July 1947. Excludes hospital benefits in California; also excludes private plans in California and New Jersey except for calendar-year totals.

⁹ Represents average weekly number of beneficiaries.

¹⁰ Represents average number of beneficiaries in a 14-day registration period.

¹¹ Readjustment allowances to unemployed veterans; from 1 to 2 percent of number and amount shown represents allowances for illness and disability after establishment of unemployment rights. Number represents average weekly number of continued claims.

¹² Claims paid under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

¹³ Payments: amounts certified, under the Social Security Act (except monthly data for monthly benefits, which represent benefits in current-payment status), the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; disbursements, for Veterans Administration programs except the readjustment allowance program; checks issued, under the State unemployment insurance and temporary disability laws and under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act; for civil-service programs, disbursements through June 1949 and authorizations beginning July 1949. Adjusted on annual basis except for Civil Service Commission data, which are adjusted monthly.

¹⁴ Preliminary.

Source: Based on reports of administrative agencies.

Table 2.—Contributions and taxes collected under selected social insurance and related programs, by specified period, 1948-51

[In thousands]

Period	Retirement, disability, and survivors insurance			Unemployment insurance		
	Federal insurance contributions ¹	Federal civil-service contributions ²	Taxes on carriers and their employees	State unemployment contributions ³	Federal unemployment taxes ⁴	Rail-road unemployment insurance contributions ⁵
Fiscal year:						
1948-49.....	\$1,690,296	\$553,461	\$563,833	\$988,065	\$222,850	\$9,816
1949-50.....	2,106,388	662,262	550,172	1,094,406	226,306	18,855
10 months ended:						
April 1949.....	1,293,079	490,755	427,613	841,338	209,709	7,519
April 1950.....	1,609,596	597,134	419,120	876,392	210,308	13,384
April 1951.....	2,305,334	623,305	433,518	1,052,425	214,462	18,246
1950						
April.....	85,657	29,554	3,229	104,439	3,692	363
May.....	274,447	32,642	5,881	211,946	14,275	197
June.....	222,345	32,486	125,171	6,068	1,723	5,273
July.....	200,876	32,326	875	121,218	1,785	222
August.....	316,310	31,398	10,492	205,106	13,470	127
September.....	185,074	333,303	125,988	6,035	1,347	5,665
October.....	181,498	34,085	2,763	116,786	1,980	17
November.....	287,928	32,168	9,817	191,143	12,398	168
December.....	239,131	39,178	132,961	9,980	2,716	5,837
1951						
January.....	131,331	33,958	1,567	96,405	16,319	22
February.....	373,787	29,752	6,508	153,307	146,981	155
March.....	239,310	31,874	139,527	12,151	13,963	8,847
April.....	150,089	35,264	3,021	140,294	3,502	186

¹ Represents contributions of employees and employers in employments covered by old-age and survivors insurance.

² Represents employee and Government contributions to the civil-service retirement and disability fund (including Alaska Railroad, Canal Zone, and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency retirement and disability funds integrated since July 1949 with principal fund); Government contributions are made in 1 month for the entire fiscal year.

³ Represents deposits in State clearing accounts of contributions plus penalties and interest collected from employers and, in 2 States, contributions from employees; excludes contributions collected for deposit in State sickness insurance funds. Data reported by State agencies; corrected to May 21, 1951.

⁴ Represents taxes paid by employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

⁵ Beginning 1947, also covers temporary disability insurance.

⁶ Represents contributions of \$28.3 million from employees, and contributions for fiscal year 1950-51 of \$305.0 million from the Federal Government.

Source: *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury*, unless otherwise noted.

Table 3.—Total Federal cash income and outgo¹ and amounts for programs under the Social Security Act, 1950, by quarter, and January-March 1951

[In millions; corrected to May 14, 1951]

Classification	1950					1951, Jan.-Mar.
	Total	Jan.-Mar.	April-June	July-Sept.	Oct.-Dec.	
Cash income ¹	\$42,451	\$12,242	\$9,309	\$10,499	\$10,401	\$18,062
Social security.....	4,081	1,064	924	1,051	1,042	1,186
Federal insurance contributions.....	2,667	674	582	702	709	744
Federal unemployment taxes.....	224	170	20	17	17	177
Deposits in unemployment trust fund ²	1,191	220	322	332	316	264
Other.....	38,370	11,178	8,385	9,448	9,359	16,876
Cash outgo ¹	41,969	10,760	11,105	9,351	10,754	11,179
Social security.....	3,726	1,076	959	782	938	1,058
Administrative expenses, Social Security Administration ³	50	12	11	13	14	16
Administrative expenses, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor.....	6	1	2	1	1	2
Grants to States ⁴	1,329	320	350	306	354	356
State withdrawals from unemployment trust fund.....	1,366	553	399	253	190	233
Old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments.....	961	186	194	196	385	448
Administrative expenses, Department of the Treasury ⁵	15	4	4	4	4	4
Other.....	38,243	9,684	10,146	8,599	9,816	10,122

¹ Cash income and outgo represent flow of cash, exclusive of borrowed cash, into and out of the general fund and trust accounts of the Treasury.

² Deposits by States of contributions collected under State unemployment insurance laws.

³ Includes administrative expenses of the Bureau of the Census in connection with searching census records for old-age and survivors insurance.

⁴ Grants for employment security administration (including employment offices), for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and for maternal and child health and welfare services; and, beginning in the last quarter of 1950, for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁵ In connection with old-age and survivors insurance.

Source: Total Federal cash income and outgo from *Treasury Bulletin*; other data from *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury*.

CHILD WELFARE FUNDS

(Continued from page 9)

public and voluntary agencies. Nevertheless, the group believed that the Children's Bureau has a function to perform in reporting to the various agencies the efforts made in other areas and in helping them set standards through the interchange of information.

The group also pointed out that the present standards in the child welfare field are for the most part minimal

and, in some instances, practically nonexistent.

Conclusions

The policies developed during the discussions at the four regional conferences and the conference of national voluntary agencies formed the basis of the *Policy Manual* issued in April by the Children's Bureau.

These policies represent a consensus on the part of the representatives of State departments of public welfare; consultants from other public

agencies, such as juvenile courts and training schools for delinquent youth; representatives from local, State, and national voluntary agencies and from the Children's Bureau. With the co-operation and good-will of professional workers in public and voluntary agencies, and of citizen groups, these policies should do much to reinforce the child welfare program. They mark a positive approach to the setting up of policies governing the use of Federal child welfare services funds.

Table 4.—Status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, by specified period, 1937–51
[In thousands]

Period	Receipts		Expenditures		Assets			
	Appropriations ¹	Interest received	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Net total of U. S. Government securities acquired ²	Cash with disbursing officer at end of period	Credit of fund account at end of period	Total assets at end of period
Cumulative, January 1937–April 1951.....	\$17,448,839	\$1,678,725	\$4,559,795	\$446,219	\$13,844,232	\$206,309	\$71,009	\$14,121,549
Fiscal year:								
1948–49.....	1,693,575	230,194	607,036	53,465	1,293,891	66,870	12,409	11,309,949
1949–50.....	2,109,992	256,778	727,266	56,841	1,414,152	79,928	167,861	12,892,612
10 months ended:								
April 1949.....	1,296,330	123,084	496,549	44,848	858,981	66,421	62,516	10,924,696
April 1950.....	1,613,200	135,176	597,791	47,353	1,047,244	83,831	51,435	12,413,181
April 1951.....	2,309,028	161,446	1,184,230	57,298	1,199,409	206,309	71,009	14,121,549
1950								
April.....	85,657		64,045	4,637	130,000	83,831	51,435	12,413,181
May.....	274,447		64,701	4,730	58,000	82,073	200,210	12,618,197
June.....	222,345	121,008	64,774	4,758	308,908	79,928	167,861	12,892,612
July.....	200,876		64,788	4,519	210,000	88,284	81,074	13,024,181
August.....	316,310		63,908	6,212	67,000	148,162	200,296	13,270,281
September.....	185,074	10,871	67,158	5,657	162,918	152,843	155,828	13,393,411
October.....	181,498		120,028	5,136	130,000	174,825	56,279	13,448,844
November.....	291,622		127,517	5,361	35,000	184,203	173,644	13,607,588
December.....	239,131	10,714	136,917	5,249	80,908	188,401	202,217	13,721,266
1951								
January.....	131,331	115,074	141,717	7,086	197,700	204,080	86,438	13,818,867
February.....	273,787		151,700	5,265	82,000	195,393	229,947	14,035,699
March.....	239,316	10,871	154,830	5,674	166,918	205,039	143,061	14,126,366
April.....	150,089	7,916	154,085	7,137	66,966	206,309	71,009	14,121,549

¹ Beginning July 1940, equals taxes collected under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act; beginning with the fiscal year 1947, includes amounts appropriated to meet administrative and other costs of benefits payable to survivors of certain World War II veterans as provided under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1946.

² Includes accrued interest and repayments on account of accrued interest on bonds at time of purchase.

Source: *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury.*

Table 5.—Status of the unemployment trust fund, by specified period, 1936–51
[In thousands]

Period	Total assets at end of period	Net total of U. S. Government securities acquired ¹	Unexpended balance at end of period	State accounts				Railroad unemployment insurance account ²			
				Deposits	Interest credited	Withdrawals ³	Balance at end of period	Deposits	Interest credited	Benefit payments	Balance at end of period ⁴
Cumulative, January 1936–April 1951.....	\$7,733,576	\$7,698,216	\$35,359	\$14,597,003	\$1,264,814	\$8,888,321	\$6,973,496	\$897,693	\$127,991	\$441,346	\$760,079
Fiscal year:											
1948–49.....	8,182,417	—160,067	44,085	984,031	160,033	1,227,115	7,282,730	77	20,067	76,978	899,687
1949–50.....	7,437,896	—724,068	23,633	1,098,795	149,046	1,879,000	6,651,571	9,728	18,020	143,904	786,325
10 months ended:											
April 1949.....	8,201,763	—128,040	31,405	768,628	85,027	925,730	7,293,706	58	10,747	61,536	908,057
April 1950.....	7,342,616	—830,041	34,325	807,885	81,537	1,614,500	6,557,652	6,446	10,034	132,496	784,964
April 1951.....	7,733,576	283,953	35,359	951,304	79,386	708,765	6,973,496	10,993	8,961	46,199	760,079
1950											
April.....	7,342,616	—110,000	34,325	31,449	591	134,775	6,557,652	360	70	8,125	784,964
May.....	7,476,118	137,000	39,828	280,437	117	141,000	6,697,206	119	14	6,184	778,912
June.....	7,437,896	—31,027	23,633	10,473	67,392	123,500	6,651,571	3,164	7,972	6,223	786,325
July.....	7,380,064	—65,000	28,801	35,113	42	89,020	6,597,705	208	5	4,179	782,359
August.....	7,578,176	210,000	16,913	287,556		84,275	6,800,986	76		5,245	777,190
September.....	7,530,538	—45,007	14,282	9,322	3,664	59,950	6,754,022	3,399	432	4,504	776,517
October.....	7,507,116	—28,000	18,860	37,516	188	56,650	6,735,076	10	22	4,508	772,041
November.....	7,704,302	198,000	18,046	256,790		55,120	6,936,716	101		4,555	767,586
December.....	7,663,410	—47,027	24,181	21,884	5,823	68,145	6,896,278	3,472	675	4,602	767,131
1951											
January.....	7,666,316		27,087	34,463	63,563	96,425	6,897,879	13	7,147	5,854	768,437
February.....	7,800,319	139,000	22,090	207,792		69,440	7,036,231	93		4,442	764,088
March.....	7,738,020	—40,008	19,799	21,652	3,662	66,770	6,994,775	3,508	412	4,763	763,245
April.....	7,733,576	—40,005	35,359	39,247	2,445	62,970	6,973,496	112	269	3,546	760,079

¹ Includes accrued interest and repayments on account of interest on bonds at time of purchase; minus figures represent primarily net total of securities redeemed.

² Includes transfers from State accounts to railroad unemployment insurance account amounting to \$107,161,000.

³ Beginning July 1947, includes temporary disability program.

⁴ Includes transfers to the account from railroad unemployment insurance ad-

ministration fund amounting to \$80,919,000 and transfers of \$12,338,000 out of the account to adjust funds available for administrative expenses on account of retroactive credits taken by contributors under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act Amendments of 1943.

⁵ Includes withdrawals of \$79,160,000 for disability insurance benefits.

Source: *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury.*

Table 6.—Old-age and survivors insurance: Monthly benefits¹ in current-payment status² at the end of the month, by type of benefit and by month, April 1950–April 1951, and monthly benefits awarded by type of benefit, April 1951

[Amounts in thousands; data corrected to May 31, 1951]

Item	Total		Old-age		Wife's or husband's		Child's		Widow's or widower's		Mother's		Parent's	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Monthly benefits in current-payment status at end of month:														
1950														
April	2,888,715	\$59,638.4	1,365,504	\$35,807.4	413,456	\$5,741.3	659,584	\$8,736.3	280,890	\$5,871.7	155,432	\$3,290.2	13,849	\$191.5
May	2,911,562	60,195.6	1,375,882	36,128.7	416,365	5,791.5	663,610	8,799.1	285,753	5,978.4	155,957	3,304.3	13,995	193.6
June	2,930,357	60,681.5	1,384,823	36,415.8	419,123	5,840.0	665,351	8,828.7	290,307	6,079.8	156,664	3,322.2	14,089	194.9
July	2,946,096	61,124.8	1,394,920	36,734.7	422,448	5,896.3	663,858	8,810.3	293,915	6,159.8	156,792	3,327.6	14,163	196.1
August	2,967,055	61,640.7	1,405,592	37,051.6	425,604	5,949.9	666,102	8,845.8	297,999	6,252.0	157,503	3,343.7	14,255	197.6
September	3,026,332	114,015.1	1,444,772	67,353.8	436,624	10,696.5	669,716	18,780.4	302,435	11,077.3	158,391	5,578.4	14,394	528.8
October	3,182,342	118,352.9	1,563,318	70,955.8	459,990	11,113.8	676,758	18,929.3	305,790	11,199.9	162,066	5,624.2	14,420	529.9
November	3,346,167	122,926.5	1,681,370	74,621.1	486,238	11,581.5	688,131	19,144.6	309,848	11,336.4	166,111	5,711.6	14,469	531.4
December	3,477,243	126,856.5	1,770,984	77,678.3	508,350	11,994.9	699,703	19,366.3	314,189	11,481.3	169,438	5,800.8	14,579	534.9
1951														
January	3,605,235	130,882.5	1,850,207	80,594.4	532,187	12,477.3	715,188	19,700.6	319,513	11,665.2	173,354	5,912.6	14,786	542.6
February	3,706,586	134,090.8	1,912,170	82,843.8	548,047	12,790.4	729,616	20,033.9	325,555	11,872.2	176,156	5,998.8	15,042	551.8
March	3,809,165	137,258.9	1,971,703	84,971.8	563,346	13,087.0	746,247	20,418.5	332,539	12,114.0	179,877	6,100.9	15,453	566.7
April	3,890,018	139,636.9	2,016,135	86,496.1	575,098	13,304.9	760,697	20,732.2	338,539	12,315.9	183,719	6,207.7	15,830	580.1
Monthly benefits awarded in April 1951	125,762	3,953.0	67,170	2,503.3	21,703	443.3	21,229	483.8	7,831	274.5	7,307	229.8	522	18.4

¹ Effective Sept. 1, 1950, under the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950: (1) husband's and widower's insurance benefits became payable; (2) the terms "primary insurance benefit" and "widow's current insurance benefit" were changed to "old-age insurance benefit" and "mother's insurance benefit," respectively.

² Benefit in current-payment status is subject to no deduction or only to deduction of fixed amount that is less than the current month's benefit.

³ Partly estimated.

SOCIAL SECURITY IN REVIEW

(Continued from page 2)

other States meant that a large number of unemployed workers who had been ineligible for benefits were able to file claims to determine their current benefit rights. Other factors contributing to the 33-percent rise in initial claims were seasonal and material shortage lay-offs in a variety of industries.

The number of weeks of unemployment claimed—representing continuing unemployment—dropped 2 percent to 3,913,000. This slight decrease resulted largely from increased activity in construction and other outside industries that counteracted the effect of lay-offs in textiles, trade, apparel, and other industries.

During an average week in April, 740,200 beneficiaries received an un-

employment insurance benefit check—8 percent fewer than in March and less than half the number in an average week in April 1950. Reflecting the downward movement in the number of beneficiaries, the total amount of benefits paid declined by \$9.3 million to \$62.3 million—a postwar low for April. The weekly benefit amount, which has shown little change for 12 months, was \$20.68.

Table 7.—Employment security: Selected data on nonfarm placements and unemployment insurance claims and benefits, by State, April 1951

[Corrected to May 23, 1951]

Region and State	Nonfarm placements	Initial claims ¹		Weeks of unemployment covered by continued claims		Compensated unemployment					Average weekly insured unemployment under all programs ⁴
		Total	Women	Total	Women	All types of unemployment ²	Benefits paid ³	Average weekly number of beneficiaries	Total unemployment	Average weekly payment	
Total, 52 States	551,631	919,171	* 430,000	3,913,298	* 1,776,000	3,108,768	\$62,294,441	740,185	2,840,315	\$20.68	958,278
Region I:											
Connecticut	8,591	14,943	9,035	44,840	25,901	33,228	621,508	7,911	30,160	19.59	11,583
Maine	2,291	13,030	7,514	40,953	22,738	21,446	206,801	5,106	10,387	14.18	11,208
Massachusetts	15,194	66,224	36,410	200,624	103,018	133,012	2,884,017	31,670	120,343	22.81	55,154
New Hampshire	1,846	11,176	6,578	30,554	17,036	17,633	290,381	4,198	14,946	17.64	7,637
Rhode Island	2,644	19,730	12,651	51,130	30,649	41,797	841,732	9,952	40,158	20.57	13,128
Vermont	842	1,525	756	4,534	2,097	3,544	66,147	844	3,247	19.35	1,198
Region II:											
New Jersey	12,344	43,576	25,863	175,240	96,271	152,768	3,271,664	36,373	139,476	22.37	43,167
New York	62,571	208,934	(⁵)	752,172	(⁵)	630,106	14,173,420	147,644	594,357	22.86	184,026
Puerto Rico	587										
Region III:											
Delaware	1,224	1,120	539	4,164	1,978	3,627	64,044	864	3,348	18.07	1,001
Pennsylvania	22,029	95,842	38,891	305,472	104,995	242,552	4,871,159	57,790	209,676	21.13	72,797
Region IV:											
District of Columbia	3,963	1,235	454	9,265	3,830	8,706	156,941	2,073	8,562	18.04	2,080
Maryland	6,904	13,302	7,319	45,435	25,275	42,687	748,286	10,164	37,595	18.44	11,642
North Carolina	13,490	14,310	9,347	86,671	58,688	72,464	972,972	17,253	67,221	13.78	20,165
Virginia	7,680	4,056	1,922	23,088	10,396	21,091	312,240	5,022	19,467	15.27	5,450
West Virginia	3,343	7,874	1,195	45,551	8,503	37,543	640,714	8,939	33,322	17.84	11,064
Region V:											
Alabama	11,117	9,123	3,011	57,344	18,002	43,417	669,943	10,338	41,396	15.71	13,454
Florida	14,871	9,952	4,691	31,039	13,994	17,217	237,434	4,099	16,436	14.01	7,527
Georgia	11,533	10,698	6,925	52,345	34,971	36,240	536,518	8,629	33,144	15.17	12,265
Mississippi	7,078	5,714	1,793	30,697	9,054	24,424	349,316	5,815	22,343	14.72	7,242
South Carolina	7,615	13,361	5,045	31,729	16,233	23,237	393,044	5,533	21,850	17.37	7,088
Tennessee	11,502	12,474	5,464	92,338	40,974	77,578	1,125,976	18,471	73,778	14.68	22,502
Region VI:											
Kentucky	2,831	13,605	5,649	74,412	23,591	58,274	948,607	13,875	55,788	16.49	17,764
Michigan	15,099	31,709	8,945	127,363	49,051	107,414	2,506,195	25,575	103,677	23.76	27,921
Ohio	32,224	24,790	12,619	117,215	56,684	96,633	1,998,434	23,008	88,567	21.35	27,746
Region VII:											
Illinois	19,115	78,159	41,963	287,893	149,133	176,567	3,600,136	42,040	136,965	22.96	72,992
Indiana	9,362	21,562	11,058	57,210	29,420	36,464	691,359	8,682	33,508	19.66	14,974
Wisconsin	8,910	5,163	2,149	34,535	14,047	26,719	568,722	6,362	24,490	21.08	7,606
Region VIII:											
Minnesota	10,498	10,366	3,641	89,799	24,394	72,817	1,263,982	17,337	68,394	17.73	18,448
Montana	3,685	1,371	464	22,738	6,923	18,267	326,138	4,349	18,267	17.85	3,946
North Dakota	2,195	436	116	10,697	1,819	9,478	191,434	2,257	8,622	20.69	1,878
South Dakota	1,710	389	177	5,917	1,386	5,841	103,022	1,391	5,459	17.09	1,084
Region IX:											
Iowa	7,569	4,705	1,937	20,580	8,018	18,182	320,215	4,329	16,284	18.32	4,845
Kansas	9,463	3,235	773	16,064	5,084	14,324	290,464	3,410	12,834	21.07	3,587
Missouri	13,297	16,628	8,253	85,371	42,840	55,479	875,107	13,209	49,170	16.74	20,409
Nebraska	6,186	975	515	9,646	3,493	9,034	166,532	2,151	8,646	18.82	2,155
Region X:											
Arkansas	11,488	8,251	2,889	40,963	11,087	26,282	424,624	6,258	24,002	17.17	8,668
Louisiana	7,830	12,599	3,066	76,958	18,649	66,197	1,326,688	15,761	61,290	20.64	18,456
Oklahoma	13,455	5,480	1,673	38,621	12,553	29,114	520,530	6,932	27,291	18.32	8,915
Texas	52,129	8,788	3,435	52,090	19,237	34,608	535,728	8,240	32,077	15.98	11,256
Region XI:											
Colorado	5,974	2,489	916	8,763	3,371	5,432	105,795	1,293	5,030	20.09	2,152
New Mexico	6,361	1,155	264	6,552	1,469	6,092	104,961	1,450	5,851	17.45	1,619
Utah	5,567	1,716	596	12,478	5,652	11,125	250,965	2,649	9,733	23.65	2,780
Wyoming	1,375	496	161	4,360	1,357	3,977	90,355	947	3,402	23.96	803
Region XII:											
Arizona	4,556	2,649	782	9,862	3,880	5,263	106,864	1,253	4,912	20.71	2,344
California	41,256	67,166	30,271	442,284	244,792	404,643	8,691,385	96,344	369,327	22.22	104,910
Hawaii	1,266	1,662	784	14,972	8,889	10,765	167,540	2,363	7,604	18.69	(⁷)
Nevada	2,880	1,024	386	6,343	2,548	5,682	132,530	1,353	5,304	23.91	1,216
Region XIII:											
Alaska	1,040	983	493	4,685	1,752	7,139	178,495	1,700	6,828	25.26	(⁷)
Idaho	4,302	772	314	10,337	2,785	9,259	173,649	2,205	8,851	19.03	1,882
Oregon	9,323	3,606	1,280	40,265	14,737	41,677	861,344	9,923	38,829	21.33	8,193
Washington	10,526	9,043	2,459	69,740	24,327	61,708	1,239,274	14,691	58,062	20.48	14,271

¹ Excludes transitional claims.

² Total, part-total, and partial.

³ Not adjusted for voided benefit checks and transfers under interstate combined-wage plan.

⁴ Unemployment represented by weeks of unemployment claimed under the State and railroad unemployment insurance programs and the veterans' unemployment allowance program. Includes partial and part-total unemployment. State distribution excludes railroad unemployment insurance claims.

⁵ Includes estimate for New York.

⁶ Data not received.

⁷ Data not available.

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, and affiliated State agencies.

Table 8.—Public assistance in the United States, by month, April 1950–April 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

Year and month	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled ¹	General assistance	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent and children (families)	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled ¹	General assistance	
			Families	Recipients										
				Total ²										Children

Number of recipients														Percentage change from previous month					
1950																			
April		2,768,093	641,875		1,628,882	94,453		605,000		+0.3	+1.1	+0.4	-7.1						
May		2,781,606	650,910		1,651,216	94,958		568,000		+5	+1.4	+5	-6.2						
June		2,790,068	654,217		1,659,766	95,418		525,000		+3	+5	+5	-7.6						
July		2,796,769	653,491		1,657,706	95,857		499,000		+2	-1	+5	-4.9						
August		2,805,011	655,583		1,663,489	96,255		485,000		+3	+3	+4	-2.8						
September		2,809,537	653,693		1,661,004	96,619		469,000		+2	-3	+4	-3.2						
October		2,781,617	643,454	2,205,468	1,637,858	96,642	58,227	401,000	-1.0	-1.6	(⁴)		-14.5						
November		2,776,670	638,115	2,188,866	1,624,545	96,941	61,026	396,000	-2	-8	+3	+4.8	-1.3						
December		2,769,229	639,652	2,195,312	1,632,236	96,910	68,775	406,000	-3	+2	(⁵)	+12.7	+2.6						
1951																			
January		2,766,678	641,374	2,203,638	1,639,019	95,504	70,745	419,000	-1	+3	-1.5	+2.9	+3.1						
February		2,760,119	640,378	2,201,156	1,637,182	95,492	74,542	415,000	-2	-2	(⁶)	+5.4	-1.0						
March		2,753,833	639,743	2,199,616	1,636,347	95,324	79,978	406,000	-2	-1	-2	+7.3	-2.1						
April		2,742,701	634,175	2,181,614	1,624,673	96,413	87,822	377,000	-4	-9	+1.1	+9.8	-7.2						
Amount of assistance														Percentage change from previous month					
1950																			
April	\$201,107,272	\$120,930,268	\$46,362,127		\$4,318,877		\$29,496,000		-2.0	-0.3	-0.3	-0.6	-11.0						
May	199,230,835	122,474,273	45,946,514		4,364,048		26,436,000		-9	+1.3	-9	+1.0	-10.4						
June	196,950,648	122,350,629	46,034,901		4,394,028		24,171,000		-1.1	-1	+2	+7	-8.6						
July	194,692,114	121,785,828	45,843,007		4,390,279		22,673,000		-1.1	-5	-4	-1	-6.2						
August	195,100,237	122,687,714	45,956,225		4,412,298		22,044,000		+2	+7	+2	+5	-2.8						
September	194,566,185	123,028,606	46,021,238		4,435,341		21,081,000		-3	+3	+1	+5	-4.4						
October	191,990,264	120,994,186	45,722,103		4,458,814	\$2,399,161	18,416,000		-1.3	-7	-6	+5	-12.6						
November	192,453,364	120,846,876	46,133,356		4,468,654	2,533,478	18,471,000		+2	-1	+9	+2	+5.6						
December	193,109,683	119,942,390	46,442,534		4,476,645	3,033,114	19,215,000		+3	-7	+7	+2	+19.7						
1951																			
January	194,688,249	119,966,838	47,239,397		4,434,374	3,170,640	19,877,000		+8	(⁴)	+1.7	-9	+4.5						
February	194,152,793	118,994,560	47,759,338		4,449,900	3,382,995	19,566,000		-3	-8	+1.1	+4	+6.7						
March	194,247,678	118,811,471	47,988,570		4,444,365	3,596,272	19,407,000		(⁴)	-2	+5	-1	+6.3						
April	191,563,599	118,124,043	47,387,245		4,490,997	3,946,314	17,615,000		-1.4	-6	-1.3	+1.0	+9.7						

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Excludes programs administered without Federal participation in States administering such programs concurrently with programs under the Social Security Act, and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for which data are not available for April 1951. All data subject to revision.

² Beginning October 1950, includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such a full were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

³ Program initiated in October 1950 under Public Law 734.

⁴ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

⁵ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 9.—Amount of vendor payments for medical care for recipients of public assistance, by program and State, February 1951¹

State ²	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	General assistance
Conn.	\$179,847	\$106,381	\$2,072	(³)	(⁴)
Del.		500			(⁴)
Ill.	400,386	35,522	11,885	\$1,456	\$419,880
Ind.	238,944	49,268	9,282	(³)	139,506
Iowa				(³)	140,465
Kans.	107,858	30,184	1,452	13,177	53,684
Maine				(³)	35,666
Minn.	495,080	25,639		(³)	68,432
Mont.					99,867
Nebr.	123,080	8,426	143	(³)	(⁴)
Nev.				(³)	2,777
N. H.	46,694	21,028	2,372	(³)	(⁴)
N. J.		12,984		(³)	87,273
N. Y.	747,207	336,436	27,343	155,373	(⁴)
N. Dak.	18,518	1,830	7	101	21,650
Ohio	110,680	9,396	6,230		405,581
Oreg.					156,453
R. I.				(³)	42,784
S. Dak.				(³)	58,000
Va.					3,592
Wis.	273,157	77,658	5,692	4,371	82,771

¹ For February data excluding vendor payments for medical care, see the *Bulletin*, May 1951.

² Excludes States that either made no vendor payments for medical care for February or did not report such payments.

³ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled in February.

⁴ Data not available.

Table 10.—Average payments including vendor payments for medical care and average amount of vendor payments per assistance case, by program and State, February 1951¹

State ²	Old-age assistance		Aid to dependent children (per family)		Aid to the blind		Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		General assistance	
	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Vendor payments for medical care
Conn.	\$69.00	\$0.00	\$125.87	\$19.00	\$69.47	\$7.00	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Del.			72.54	.72					(³)	(³)
Ill.	46.57	3.33	99.14	1.50	50.07	2.77	\$44.37	\$3.51	\$57.42	\$10.61
Ind.	39.59	4.65	69.39	4.42	42.59	4.93	(³)	(³)	\$30.05	\$12.52
Kans.	51.54	2.75	86.68	5.79	53.08	2.18	51.91	5.29	50.93	15.36
Mich.									38.55	2.44
Minn.	51.79	8.92	93.83	3.24			(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Nebr.	48.35	5.30	84.10	2.39	57.37	.19	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
Nev.							(³)	(³)	30.21	4.02
N. H.	52.23	6.30	118.43	12.55	57.72	7.41	(³)	(³)	(³)	(³)
N. J.			94.05	2.43			(³)	(³)	\$56.33	\$9.04
N. Y.	60.19	6.32	114.29	6.03	68.24	6.75	65.27	6.20	(³)	(³)
N. Dak.	51.98	2.02	105.37	.99	56.72	.06	49.57	.44	63.55	22.39
Ohio	45.56	.91	78.79	.63	46.92	1.60			(³)	(³)
Oreg.									58.77	17.41
R. I.							(³)	(³)	55.49	7.68
Va.									24.54	.97
Wis.	47.66	5.22	110.59	8.08	52.48	4.04	68.23	5.77	56.25	11.26

¹ For February data excluding vendor payments for medical care, see the *Bulletin*, May 1951. All averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both.

² Excludes States that made no vendor payments for medical care for February or did not report such payments. Also excludes States for which count of cases is believed to be incomplete.

³ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁴ Data on vendor payments for medical care not available.

⁵ Based on figures that include cases receiving burial only and total payments for these services.

⁶ Not computed because count of cases believed to be incomplete.

⁷ Based on figures that include cases receiving burial only.

Table 11.—Old-age assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1951¹
[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	March 1951 in—		April 1950 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total ²	2,742,701	\$118,124,043	\$43.07	-0.4	-0.6	-0.9	-2.3
Ala.	81,090	1,674,273	20.65	-4	+1	+1.5	+2.2
Alaska	1,607	91,510	56.94	+2	+7	+7	-4.0
Ariz.	13,926	707,652	50.82	-4.3	-6.4	+6.4	+2.8
Ark.	67,819	1,475,380	21.75	-1.1	-16.7	+5.4	-10.7
Calif.	273,206	18,367,068	67.23	-2	-3	+2.9	-2.1
Colo. ³	51,901	3,463,374	66.73	-1	-3	+3.2	+4.8
Conn.	19,891	1,301,776	65.42	-1	+6	+2.6	-9
Del.	1,565	44,998	28.73	-9	-9	-6.0	-3.8
D. C.	2,827	135,055	47.77	+1	+6.4	-4	+11.2
Fla.	69,390	2,693,604	38.82	-1	-2	+1.4	+12.9
Ga.	102,064	2,451,728	24.02	(⁴)	+3	+2.8	+6.2
Hawaii	2,299	76,437	33.25	+8	-4	-3.4	-4.0
Idaho	11,344	526,892	46.45	-8	-1.0	-1.1	-2.5
Ill.	116,833	5,149,891	44.08	-6	-5	-8.0	-3.4
Ind.	49,815	1,700,031	35.33	-9	-1.5	-4.4	-6.3
Iowa	48,963	2,430,484	49.64	-2	+1	-5	+4
Kans.	38,713	1,894,577	48.94	-6	-8	-7	-3.5
Ky.	67,209	1,386,984	20.62	+1	+3	+6.0	+5.2
La.	118,111	5,499,811	46.56	-2	-3	-3.4	-4.8
Maine	13,166	649,437	42.82	-6	-8	+1.5	-9
Md.	11,612	438,641	37.77	-6	-4	-2.9	-1.1
Mass.	101,870	6,362,281	62.45	-1	+1.0	+1.2	-3.4
Mich.	96,662	4,492,149	46.47	(⁴)	-3	-3.3	-4.4
Minn.	55,070	2,336,623	42.43	-2	-9	-1.3	-14.9
Miss.	59,759	1,098,088	18.38	-9	-9	-5.4	-9.0
Mo.	131,887	5,699,705	43.22	(⁴)	-1	+1.1	+3
Mont.	11,835	635,893	53.73	+1	+2	+4	+9
Nebr.	22,915	994,497	43.40	(⁴)	-4	-4.0	-5.0
Nev.	2,743	142,551	51.97	-4	-5	+5.5	+1.5
N. H.	7,297	337,489	46.25	-1.0	-6	-1.6	+3.1
N. J.	23,401	1,137,741	48.62	-9	+4	-3.9	-4.6
N. Mex.	10,558	405,138	38.37	+2	+1	+5.1	+12.8
N. Y.	115,728	6,305,466	54.49	-9	-9	-4.2	-4
N. C.	61,356	1,363,315	22.22	-1	(⁴)	+1.9	+3.0
N. Dak.	9,066	432,292	49.89	-3	-6	+1.3	+5.6
Ohio	120,857	5,380,030	44.52	-2	-3	-4.2	-7.7
Okla.	98,908	4,461,023	45.10	-2	-3	-2.0	-1.5
Oreg.	23,336	1,262,643	54.11	-6	-4	-1.1	+3
Pa.	81,266	3,124,227	38.44	-1.5	-1.7	-12.9	-13.4
R. I.	9,825	443,195	45.11	-6	-3	-4.8	-7.5
S. C.	42,355	1,057,210	24.96	+4	+6	+2.8	+6.0
S. Dak.	12,173	492,478	40.46	-5	+2	(⁴)	+3.6
Tenn.	65,819	1,948,227	29.60	-2	-7	+2.5	-2.5
Tex.	222,508	7,272,170	32.68	-6	-6	-4	-3.2
Utah	9,866	484,963	49.15	-3	+4.9	-3.0	+5.4
Vt.	6,842	248,187	36.27	-1.4	-9	+1.9	+5.2
Va.	19,625	430,107	21.92	-3	+3	+1.2	+3.6
Wash. ⁵	71,082	4,472,783	62.92	-8	-1.0	-2.0	-5.5
W. Va.	26,209	690,464	26.34	-9	-1.1	-1.9	+18.9
Wis.	52,099	2,227,544	42.76	-4	(⁴)	-1.2	-1.9
Wyo.	4,373	246,021	56.26	-3	-2	+2.8	+4.6
P. R. ⁶	17,190	129,962	7.56	+1.2	-1		

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. All data subject to revision.

² Includes 4,026 recipients under 65 years of age in Colorado and payments to these recipients. Such payments are made without Federal participation. Excludes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for which April data are not available.

³ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

⁴ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

⁵ Represents data for March 1951.

Table 12.—Aid to the blind: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1951¹
[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	March 1951 in—		April 1950 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total ²	96,413	\$4,490,997	\$46.58	+1.1	+1.0	+2.1	+4.0
Total, 48 States ³	93,600	4,377,642	46.77	+1.2	+1.1	+22.8	+21.9
Ala.	1,551	34,285	22.11	-1.6	-4	+8.2	+5.6
Ariz.	853	48,597	56.97	-4.0	-6.7	+4.5	-2.3
Ark.	2,020	52,949	26.21	-8	-16.2	+5.5	-8.8
Calif. ⁴	11,053	906,613	82.02	-1	-1	+8.8	+8.0
Colo.	364	21,307	58.54	-2.2	-3.7	-6.7	-3.6
Conn.	308	20,031	65.04	+1.3	+5.3	+22.7	+37.3
Del.	204	9,001	44.12	+1.5	+1.4	+12.7	+21.5
D. C.	260	13,295	51.13	-8	+4.6	-1.9	+10.8
Fla.	3,321	141,472	42.60	+2	-1	+1.2	+13.5
Ga.	2,844	82,102	28.87	-4	(⁴)	+7.2	+12.4
Hawaii	116	4,339	37.41	+1.8	+2.5	+4.5	+2.7
Idaho	208	11,107	53.40	-1.0	-1.4	-3.3	+3
Ill.	4,199	201,169	47.91	-3	-3	-5.7	-3
Ind.	1,816	70,037	38.57	-6	-8	-3.5	-4.2
Iowa	1,262	73,131	57.95	+5	+9	+4.3	+7.0
Kans.	662	33,798	51.05	-7	-1.3	-12.7	-14.8
Ky.	2,475	55,039	22.24	+5	+9	+12.2	+13.1
La.	1,871	82,028	43.84	-1	+2	+2.7	+5.0
Maine	656	29,886	45.56	-3	-1	-6	+1.6
Md.	486	20,344	41.86	+1.2	+1.6	+1.0	+2.8
Mass.	1,553	108,314	69.66	+1.0	+2.4	+4.2	+10.4
Mich.	1,863	96,544	51.82	+3	+3	+4	+1.9
Minn.	1,157	66,414	57.40	+1.8	+2.9	+6.6	+3.2
Miss.	2,773	64,931	23.42	-6	-6	+6	-11.1
Mo.	2,778	111,189	40.00	-3	-3	-1.3	-7.3
Mont.	530	31,663	59.74	+2	+1	+3.1	+6.6
Nebr.	736	43,406	58.98	-1	+6	+8.7	+13.5
Nev.	33	2,235	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
N. H.	321	16,072	50.07	-3	+3	-6	+6.2
N. J.	774	41,985	54.24	+3	+7	+3.2	+3.3
N. Mex.	522	19,134	36.66	+2	-3	+9.4	+12.2
N. Y.	4,012	250,162	62.35	-1	+1	+1.9	+9.2
N. C.	4,391	151,009	34.39	+1.2	+1.3	+8.4	+10.6
N. Dak.	109	5,964	54.72	-2.7	-0.4	-6.8	+2.0
Ohio	3,880	176,439	45.47	-2	-4	+1.1	+2.4
Okla.	2,657	136,245	51.28	-3	+6.8	-1.8	+9.3
Oreg.	399	26,542	66.52	0	+1	+2.0	+14.6
Pa.	15,291	606,443	39.66	-4	-1	-8	-1.0
R. I.	183	10,120	55.30	-1.1	+3	+5.2	+10.0
S. C.	1,578	43,019	27.26	+6	+1.3	+5.3	-7.0
S. Dak.	217	8,323	38.35	-1.8	-9	-1.8	+5.6
Tenn.	2,725	102,716	37.69	+6	+5	+6.4	+6.2
Tex.	0,080	225,447	37.08	+24.2	+24.5	-4.8	-7.0
Utah	209	11,077	53.00	-5	+3.7	-5	+9.0
Vt.	180	7,178	39.88	-2.2	-1.5	-3.7	-6
Va.	1,517	45,439	29.95	-1.2	-1.0	+3	+2.5
Wash. ⁵	850	65,968	77.61	+8	+2.1	+4.8	+4.2
W. Va.	1,070	33,390	31.21	-6	-3	+4.5	+26.7
Wis.	1,389	67,651	48.70	+1	+1	-9	+3.8
Wyo.	103	5,517	53.56	-1.0	-2.1	(⁴)	(⁴)
P. R. ⁶	532	3,725	7.00	+1.3	-3.1		

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent programs administered without Federal participation. Data exclude program in Connecticut administered without Federal participation concurrently with program under the Social Security Act. Alaska does not administer aid to the blind. Totals exclude Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for which April data are not available. All data subject to revision.

² Includes 579 recipients of aid to the partially self-supporting blind in California and 18 in Washington and payments to these recipients. Such payments are made without Federal participation.

³ States with plans approved by the Social Security Administration. Includes recipients of and payments for aid to the partially self-supporting blind in California and Washington.

⁴ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

⁵ Excludes cost of medical care, for which payments are made to recipients quarterly.

⁶ Represents statutory monthly pension of \$40 per recipient; excludes payment for other than a month.

⁷ Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 recipients; percentage change, on less than 100 recipients.

⁸ Represents data for March 1951; not included in totals.

Table 13.—Aid to dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from—			
		Total ²	Children	Total amount	Average per—		March 1951 in—		April 1950 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of families	Amount	Number of families	Amount
Total.....	634,175	³ 2,181,614	1,624,673	\$47,387,245	\$74.72	⁴ \$21.72	-0.9	-1.3	-1.2	+2.2
Total, 50 States ⁴	634,149	³ 2,181,523	1,624,608	47,386,286	74.72	\$21.72	-0.9	-1.3	-1.2	+2.2
Alabama.....	18,898	64,892	52,211	643,903	34.07	9.92	-2	+1.2	+11.2	+15.9
Alaska.....	665	2,187	1,584	46,491	69.91	21.26	+8	+1.0	+5.6	+34.0
Arizona.....	4,111	15,482	11,592	311,100	75.68	20.09	-3.8	-19.1	+6.2	-7.3
Arkansas.....	16,500	57,290	43,501	575,910	34.90	10.05	-10.2	-24.9	+3.7	-14.0
California.....	57,139	177,182	132,041	6,338,700	110.93	35.78	+4	+5	+25.8	+25.2
Colorado.....	5,624	20,608	15,464	517,534	92.02	25.12	+2	-4	-1.5	+7.1
Connecticut.....	5,577	18,166	13,093	602,311	108.00	33.16	-3	+2	+14.5	+7.7
Delaware.....	704	2,727	2,083	51,001	72.44	18.70	+1.7	+1.7	+8.1	+8.4
District of Columbia.....	2,160	8,601	6,582	210,681	97.54	24.49	0	+6.8	+4.8	+25.7
Florida.....	29,001	94,984	71,092	1,449,597	49.98	18.26	-1	+1	+9.2	+9.1
Georgia.....	18,788	61,570	47,606	570,332	46.32	14.14	+2.2	+2.0	+30.5	+32.3
Hawaii.....	3,563	13,465	10,368	311,592	87.45	23.14	-1.5	-2.6	-4.6	-5.4
Idaho.....	2,503	8,586	6,286	261,021	104.28	30.40	-8	-1.0	-2.3	+1.1
Illinois.....	23,472	82,412	60,958	2,304,912	98.20	27.97	-7	-5	-7.0	+7
Indiana.....	10,654	34,952	25,745	696,811	65.40	19.94	-1.7	-2.7	-6.5	-7.4
Iowa.....	5,282	18,534	13,796	⁵ 515,856	97.66	27.83	+9	+1.1	+2.2	+28.5
Kansas.....	5,058	17,707	13,282	414,813	82.01	23.43	-1.4	-1.4	-10.7	-13.1
Kentucky.....	23,918	83,603	61,423	894,139	37.38	10.68	-1	(⁶)	+16.3	+14.8
Louisiana.....	25,022	89,524	66,084	1,237,787	49.47	13.53	-3.2	-3.1	-18.2	-30.9
Maine.....	4,567	15,955	11,635	339,915	74.43	21.30	+3	(⁶)	+17.8	+34.4
Maryland.....	6,318	24,313	18,472	506,844	80.22	20.85	-8	+2	-3.3	-1.0
Massachusetts.....	13,435	44,417	32,554	1,478,972	110.08	33.30	+1	-8	+5	-3.1
Michigan.....	25,554	82,530	58,667	2,324,808	90.98	28.17	-2	+1.2	-8.6	-6.4
Minnesota.....	7,978	26,888	20,313	724,867	90.86	26.96	+8	+6	(⁷)	-9
Mississippi.....	10,725	⁸ 40,176	30,738	200,780	18.72	⁹ 5.00	(⁶)	+5	-2.6	-32.4
Missouri.....	24,341	82,304	60,299	1,265,905	52.01	15.38	-5	-5	-6.1	-7.3
Montana.....	2,477	8,594	6,318	214,016	86.40	24.90	+5	+8	-2.7	+6
Nebraska.....	3,493	11,254	8,347	285,143	81.63	25.24	-1	-3	-6.0	-8.0
Nevada.....	⁸	⁹	⁶⁵	⁸⁶⁹	(⁶)	(⁶)	(⁶)	(⁶)	(⁶)	(⁶)
New Hampshire.....	1,647	5,582	4,068	172,611	104.80	30.92	-7	-1.1	+9	+16.9
New Jersey.....	5,235	17,612	13,295	457,590	87.41	25.98	-1.1	-7.1	-7.2	-6.9
New Mexico.....	5,554	19,229	14,560	332,436	59.86	17.29	+6	+5	+6.2	+21.5
New York.....	54,800	183,117	130,406	5,973,044	109.00	33.62	-1.3	-2.0	-7.8	-1.6
North Carolina.....	16,420	⁸ 59,803	45,936	740,492	45.10	⁹ 12.36	+7	+1.1	+10.2	+14.5
North Dakota.....	1,875	6,778	5,112	194,684	103.83	28.72	-3	-1.2	+1.4	+1.1
Ohio.....	14,871	54,170	40,552	1,147,201	77.14	21.18	+1	+5	+3.7	+29.3
Oklahoma.....	21,896	73,255	55,654	1,540,154	70.34	21.02	+2	(⁶)	-5.6	+49.3
Oregon.....	4,262	14,018	10,467	449,646	105.50	32.08	+1.4	+7	+13.9	+14.7
Pennsylvania.....	42,436	151,520	111,958	3,714,098	87.52	24.51	-3.6	-5.1	-33.4	-24.0
Rhode Island.....	3,381	11,330	8,124	297,758	88.07	26.28	-1.2	-1.7	-11.8	-11.7
South Carolina.....	6,684	25,022	19,319	260,997	39.05	10.43	-2	-4	-23.6	-19.0
South Dakota.....	2,598	8,502	6,337	179,442	69.07	21.11	+1	+1.3	+12.8	+24.4
Tennessee.....	23,774	84,765	63,642	1,133,207	47.67	13.37	-1.2	-1.3	-2.3	-4.1
Texas.....	19,554	74,917	55,638	849,192	43.43	11.34	+5	+7	+5.6	+2.0
Utah.....	3,207	11,177	8,258	341,123	106.37	30.52	-2.6	+7.2	-10.7	+13.5
Vermont.....	1,032	3,592	2,792	55,381	53.66	15.42	-6	-2	+7	+4
Virginia.....	8,523	31,714	24,067	433,583	50.87	13.67	-7	+8	+6.7	+15.6
Washington.....	11,351	37,414	26,946	1,470,004	129.50	39.29	-3	-1.0	-9.8	+15.9
West Virginia.....	17,837	65,919	50,757	1,038,889	58.24	15.76	-1.1	-1.2	-4.7	+18.7
Wisconsin.....	9,043	30,710	22,612	944,418	104.44	30.75	+4	+1.0	-3.5	+1.8
Wyoming.....	642	2,399	1,706	64,565	100.57	28.08	0	+1	+9.7	+13.3
Puerto Rico ¹⁰	11,458	36,386	27,149	97,402	8.50	2.68	+5	+1.5	-----	-----

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent program administered without Federal participation. Data exclude programs in Florida, Kentucky, and Nebraska administered without Federal participation concurrently with programs under the Social Security Act. Totals exclude Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for which April data are not available. All data subject to revision.

² Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

³ Number of adults included in total number of recipients is estimated.

⁴ States with plans approved by the Social Security Administration.

⁵ Excludes cost of medical care, for which payments are made to recipients quarterly.

⁶ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

⁷ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

⁸ Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 families; percentage change, on less than 100 families.

⁹ In addition to these payments from aid to dependent children funds, supplemental payments of \$100,662 from general assistance funds were made to 2,927 families.

¹⁰ Represents data for March 1951; not included in totals.

BENEFITS, BY STATE (Continued from page 16)

covered employment in the wage histories of persons in these areas, which

tend to reduce the average monthly wages from which the benefits were computed. To a lesser extent, the averages reflected the prevailing wage

rates in the different regions. The same general pattern is also evident with respect to the averages for the other types of benefits.

Table 14.—Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, April 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients	
		Total amount	Average
Total ²	87,822	\$3,946,314	\$44.94
Alabama	8,257	178,001	21.56
Colorado	788	35,683	45.08
Delaware	85	3,307	41.26
District of Columbia	787	42,260	53.70
Hawaii	535	24,158	45.16
Idaho	509	24,834	48.79
Illinois	945	39,448	41.74
Kansas	2,548	119,338	46.84
Louisiana	14,713	456,928	31.06
Maryland	1,453	60,635	41.73
Michigan	395	22,260	56.35
Mississippi	361	5,930	16.43
Missouri	6,819	318,540	46.71
Montana	786	46,031	58.56
New Mexico	1,054	43,882	41.63
New York	22,681	1,333,714	58.80
North Carolina	1,379	37,244	27.01
North Dakota	337	17,295	51.32
Ohio	1,973	85,326	43.25
Oregon	1,858	82,149	65.30
Pennsylvania	9,644	385,846	40.01
South Carolina	1,895	61,336	32.37
Utah	1,501	82,254	54.80
Vermont	167	2,588	15.50
Virginia	1,692	55,136	32.59
Washington	3,875	304,314	78.53
West Virginia	200	6,755	33.78
Wisconsin	759	48,348	63.70
Wyoming	426	22,737	53.37

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. Figures in italics represent programs under State plans not yet approved by the Social Security Administration. Excludes the Virgin Islands, for which April data are not available. All data subject to revision.

² Represents States reporting plans in operation.

Table 15.—General assistance: Cases and payments to cases, by State, April 1951¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of cases	Payments to cases		Percentage change from—			
		Total amount	Average	March 1951 in—		April 1950 in—	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total ²	377,000	\$17,615,000	\$46.74	-7.2	-0.2	-37.7	-40.3
Ala.	74	1,695	22.91	(³)	(³)	-99.1	-98.4
Alaska	122	5,036	41.28	+16.2	+34.3	-8	+5.6
Ariz.	1,193	45,772	38.37	-17.9	-16.6	-17.0	-6.1
Ark. ⁴	2,524	32,710	12.96	-1.7	-1.7	-3.8	-2.5
Calif.	33,398	1,434,616	42.96	-7.0	-4.6	-37.3	-41.2
Colo.	3,766	155,689	41.34	-17.5	-19.4	-25.5	-21.7
Conn.	4,112	201,259	48.94	-5.0	-7.9	-38.0	-42.2
Del.	1,034	36,057	34.87	-4.4	-7.5	-30.7	-33.4
D. C.	1,003	55,362	55.20	-4.0	+2.2	-38.1	-28.6
Fla.	5,000	77,000	15.40	-2.2	-1.8	+7.7	+5.9
Ga.	3,343	55,442	16.58	-4.8	-5.3	-12.4	-11.5
Hawaii	3,471	175,882	50.67	-10.9	-13.7	-49.4	-50.7
Idaho ⁵	277	9,524	34.38	-6.5	-7.5	-27.8	-28.2
Ill.	33,379	1,672,448	50.10	-7.4	-10.0	-37.5	-35.9
Ind. ⁶	10,318	297,869	28.87	-8.8	-14.4	-16.5	-7.5
Iowa	3,794	114,422	30.16	-6.5	-7.7	-62.8	-56.9
Kans.	2,613	108,786	41.63	-6.6	-6.3	-4.5	-1.0
Ky.	3,198	75,869	23.72	-4.7	-4.5	-79.4	-83.9
La.	5,746	170,753	29.72	-5.3	-9.6	-28.7	-32.3
Maine	4,059	169,783	41.83	-8.8	-7.5	-18.9	-18.2
Md.	4,562	207,319	45.44	-4.5	-13.7	-21.1	-23.4
Mass.	20,883	1,060,971	50.81	-7.1	-14.3	-54.6	-65.5
Mich.	21,585	898,781	41.64	-5.6	-9.7	-19.4	-19.0
Minn.	6,982	331,894	47.54	+3.9	+3.2	+14.7	+14.0
Miss.	827	9,379	11.34	-4.3	-4.9	-31.2	-35.2
Mo.	11,948	366,806	30.70	-14.3	-24.0	-43.8	-51.4
Mont.	878	28,777	32.78	-6.2	-3.1	-14.8	-6.5
Nebr.	1,554	55,848	35.94	-2.4	+32.1	+5.3	+44.0
Nev.	400	14,400	36.00	-7.0	-11.2	-42.5	-44.9
N. H.	1,442	58,060	40.26	-6.9	-10.0	-36.5	-39.3
N. J. ⁷	8,935	506,892	56.73	-12.2	-12.4	-46.9	-49.6
N. Mex.	947	21,410	22.61	-3.4	-4.8	-37.0	-34.0
N. Y.	60,412	4,541,953	75.18	-16.5	-13.5	-23.2	-8.8
N. C.	3,285	56,360	17.16	-17.3	-24.7	-29.7	-31.0
N. Dak.	804	29,941	37.24	-6.8	-8.1	-40.8	-46.4
Ohio ⁸	22,948	946,319	41.24	(¹¹)	+2	(¹¹)	+7.3
Okla.	7,800	115,346	14.79	-18.9	-20.6	-40.3	-36.2
Oreg.	5,098	296,605	58.18	-15.4	-15.4	-46.5	-52.7
Pa.	29,238	1,471,558	50.33	-7.6	-13.1	-39.2	-45.1
R. I.	4,565	253,116	55.45	-9	-1	(¹²)	(¹²)
S. C.	3,200	56,865	17.77	+9.8	-3	-3.5	-5.7
S. Dak.	1,103	29,907	27.11	-21.0	-8.5	-3.1	-3.8
Tenn.	2,307	29,756	12.90	+14.2	+13.1	-54.3	-48.4
Tex.	5,200	100,000	19.23	-7	+2.5	-28.3	-24.9
Utah	1,290	67,296	52.17	-21.5	-22.3	-31.2	-20.3
Vt.	1,000	35,000	35.00	-1.8	-2.0	+4.0	+2.7
Va.	3,513	91,827	26.14	-7.8	-10.4	-44.7	-49.2
Wash.	12,127	812,238	66.98	-28.5	-26.4	-63.2	-70.2
W. Va.	5,432	121,608	22.39				
Wis.	5,993	295,452	49.30				
Wyo.	210	7,754	36.92				
P. R. ¹³	5,866	41,924	7.15				

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1951, p. 21. All data subject to revision.

² Partly estimated; does not represent sum of State figures because total excludes for Indiana and New Jersey payments made for, and an estimated number of cases receiving, medical care, hospitalization, and burial only. Excludes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for which April data are not available.

³ Percentage change not calculated on base of less than 100 cases.

⁴ State program only; excludes program administered by local officials.

⁵ About 7 percent of this total is estimated.

⁶ Partly estimated.

⁷ Excludes assistance in kind and cases receiving assistance in kind only and, for a few counties, cash payments and cases receiving cash payments. Amount of payments shown represents about 60 percent of total.

⁸ Includes unknown number of cases receiving medical care, hospitalization, and burial only, and total payments for these services.

⁹ Includes cases receiving medical care only.

¹⁰ Includes 2,927 cases and payments of \$100,662 representing supplementation of aid to dependent children payments.

¹¹ Excludes estimated duplication between programs; 1,375 cases were aided by county commissioners and 6,777 cases under program administered by State Board of Public Welfare. Average per case and percentage changes not computed.

¹² Not computed; comparable data not available.

¹³ Estimated.

¹⁴ Estimated on basis of reports from a sample of cities and towns.

¹⁵ Represents data for March 1951.